

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XIV

JULY, 1921

NUMBER 3

CHRISTIAN WRITERS ON JUDAISM

GEORGE FOOT MOORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

I. TO THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY *

CHRISTIAN interest in Jewish literature has always been apologetic or polemic rather than historical. The writers of the New Testament set themselves to demonstrate from the Scriptures that Jesus was the expected Messiah by showing that his nativity, his teaching and miracles, the rejection of him by his people, his death, resurrection, and ascension, were minutely foretold in prophecy, the exact fulfilment of which in so many particulars was conclusive proof of the truth of his claims, and left no room to doubt that his own prediction would be fulfilled in the speedy coming of the Son of Man to judgment, as Daniel had seen him in his vision. In the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews and in the Gospel according to John the aim is not so much to prove that Jesus was the Messiah of Jewish expectation as that the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom Christians believed that they had salvation from their sins and the assurance of a blessed immortality, was a divine being, the Son of God, the Word of God incarnate; and this higher faith also sought its evidence in the Scriptures. The apologetic of the following centuries, especially that which addresses itself to Jewish objections, has the same chief topics: Jesus was the Christ (Messiah), and Christ is a divine being. Others, which also have their antecedents in the New Testament, are accessory to these,

* The following pages are not meant to be a history of the literature or even an introduction to it. The author's aim has been to show the influences which have determined its character in successive periods and to illustrate these stages by certain outstanding works, laying thus the foundation for a critical examination of modern representations of Judaism to which the second part of this study is devoted.

particularly the emancipation of Christians from the Mosaic law, or the annulment of the dispensation of law altogether, or the substitution of the new law of Christ; the repudiation of the Jewish people by God for their rejection of Christ, and the succession of the church, the true Israel, the people of God, to all the prerogatives and promises once given to the Jews.

The volume of anti-Judaic apology still extant or known to us through titles and quotations is considerable.¹ The earliest, a discussion between Jason, a Jewish Christian, and an Alexandrian Jew called Papiscus, written probably not long after the Jewish revolt under Hadrian and attributed to Ariston of Pella, is lost. Not much later comes the best known of the Greek apologies of this type, Justin Martyr's Dialogue with the Jew Trypho. The literary form of dialogue was chosen because it enabled the writers to combat Jewish objections as well as to develop their own argument in the way best adapted to their purpose. No doubt there was abundance of real controversy between Jews and Christians, through which the apologists were acquainted with the points of their opponents' argument, but in the apologies the Jewish disputant is a man of straw, who raises his difficulties and makes objections only to give the Christian opportunity to show how easily they are resolved or refuted, while in the end the Jew is made to admit himself vanquished. This of itself shows that the authors did not write to convert Jews but to edify Christians, possibly also to convince Gentiles wavering between the rival propaganda of the synagogue and the church. The argument for the divinity of Christ turns largely upon the theophanies of the Old Testament and the appearances of the Angel of the Lord, in which Philo had already recognized the manifestation of a divine being, the Logos, distinct from the transcendent Supreme God. Of Latin apologies the most noteworthy is Tertullian *Adversus Judaeos*. The occasion of the work, the author tells us, was a protracted discussion between a Christian and a convert to

¹ The most recent conspectus of this branch of Christian apologetic down to the fifth century, with the modern literature, will be found in Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire Romain* (1914), i, 53-76. For a general survey of the whole field reference may be made to L. Blau, 'Polemics and Polemical Literature,' *Jewish Encyclopedia*, x, 102-109.

Judaism; but the argument is not conducted in the form of disputation.²

All the early apologies have much in common both in the topics and in the scriptures adduced. Later authors undoubtedly made free use of their predecessors, and collections of *loci probantia* from the Old Testament were made expressly for the use of controversialists. The argument is purely biblical; the interpretation, in large part symbolical or allegorical, is fixed in a tradition and repeated by one after another. There is more reality in the homilies of Aphraates directed against the Jews and in Chrysostom's sermons *Adversus Judaeos*. In the former we see that an aggressive Jewish polemic in the Persian Empire made necessary a vigorous defense, and in the latter that many Christians in Antioch were so strongly attracted by Jewish festivals and other ceremonies, especially by the great fast of the Day of Atonement, as to arouse apprehension that their Judaizing predispositions might carry them farther than the spectacular. The last important representative of the older species of apologetic is Isidore of Seville, *De fide catholica ex Veteri et Novo Testamento contra Judaeos*. The first book sets forth the catholic doctrine of the Person of Christ, the Son of God begotten of the Father *ante saecula ineffabiliter*; Christ *deus et dominus*; the Trinity; the incarnation, passion, resurrection, and ascension. In the second book the author deals with the rejection of the Jews and the passing of the gospel to the Gentiles, the abrogation of the Old Testament with all its institutions, and the establishment of the New with its sacraments. Isidore thus sums up and systematizes the Latin apologetic which he transmits to the early Middle Age, fundamentally doctrinal and still strictly biblical.

Of early Jewish apologetic and polemic we have hardly any knowledge except what is narrated in the Talmud of Palestinian Rabbis, chiefly of the third and early fourth centuries, who engaged in discussion with Catholic Christians about points of

² Joseph Scaliger's estimate of these apologies is not unfair: *Judaei hodie cum disputant, sunt subtilis. Justinus Martyr quam misere contra Tryphonem scripsit, et Tertullianus! Debet esse valde peritus Judaismi, qui Judaeos volet reprehendere et refutare.* (Quoted by Wagenseil, p. 89.)

interpretation, or controverted the doctrines of the church, particularly about the person of Christ.³ The objections which are hereditary in the Christian apologies bear no mark of derivation from Jewish writings. That there were such in the second century is intrinsically probable, and it is possible that Celsus drew upon them in his *True Account*. More than this cannot safely be said; of a Jewish literature in Greek or Latin there is from that time on no trace. After Christianity became the established religion of the Empire and the conversion of Christians to Judaism was made a high crime, writings directed against the church and its doctrines or intended to make propaganda for Judaism are not likely to have been numerous. The situation was different in the Persian Empire, as we have seen in the case of Aphraates, and after the Arab conquest in the countries under Moslem rule, where Jews and Christians were upon an equal footing and some of the Caliphs were entertained at court by discussions of the merits of the three religions; but there Christian apologetic had a more urgent task in defense against attacks from the Moslem side.

In the Oriental revival of learning, in which the Jews had an active part, scholars arose among them who were well acquainted with the New Testament and the intricacies of Christian doctrine. The controversies of the tenth century between Rabbanite and Karaite Jews presently led both to include Christianity and Islam in their apologetic. Saadia (d. 942), the protagonist of the orthodox and the first to undertake a systematic exposition and defense of Jewish theology, disputes not only the Christian arguments to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, particularly that drawn from Daniel 9, 24-27, but the doctrines of the Trinity and the Person of Christ, on the last of which topics he specifies four distinct theories, including the most recent. His contemporary, the Karaite Kirkisani, sets the belief and teaching of the immediate disciples of Jesus in contrast to the doctrines of the church; according to him it was Paul who was the author of the doctrine

³ Some illustrations are given by Blau in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, x, 103; see also Bacher, *Die Agada der Palästinensischen Amoräer*, i, 555 f. (Simlai); ii, 115-118 (Abahu); and the indexes under 'Christen, Christenthum.'

of the Trinity and the divine Sonship. In general it may be said that the Jewish apologists of the following centuries not only endeavor to refute the Christian arguments drawn from the Old Testament, but carry the controversy over into their opponents' territory by criticism of both the New Testament and the dogmas of the church.

In the following period the intellectual hegemony of the Moslem world passed to the West, where learning and science were eagerly cultivated, and philosophy engaged some of the best minds. The Jews participated in this movement, and in all spheres some of them stood in the front rank. There was much discussion among the adherents of the three religions which divided among them the mixed populations of the Iberian peninsula concerning the foundations of their respective faiths and the truth of their doctrines. When Christians entered into such controversy with Jews they were in a very different position from their apologetic predecessors. They had to deal, not with fictitious opponents, but with real antagonists who stoutly defended themselves and struck back hard. Moreover, the defenders of Judaism now compelled their adversaries to meet them in the biblical argument on the ground of the Hebrew Scriptures, not of a disputable Greek or Latin version. They had not only a traditional knowledge of the language but, following in the footsteps of the Arab philologists, had made serviceable Hebrew grammars and dictionaries; they possessed commentaries on the Old Testament in which the text was interpreted on a sound philological method and frequently with historical and critical insight, and they distinguished clearly between the literal sense and homiletic improvements. They were learned also in the traditions of Judaism preserved in Talmud and Midrash, and in its normative teaching and practice. They defined and systematized its beliefs and doctrinal tenets, harmonized them with Scripture and philosophy, and undertook to prove them both by authority and reason.

Christian controversialists, if they were not henceforth to beat the air, were thus put under the necessity of knowing Jewish literature, ancient as well as modern. It did them no good to *assert* their interpretation of their Old Testament

proof-texts; they had to *demonstrate* it. One of the most effective ways to do this was to show that their interpretation, though denied by contemporary opponents, had the support of ancient tradition — Targum, Talmud, Midrash — whose authority the Jews could not dispute, or that it was conceded by more recent Jewish exegetes of high repute. Thus to array the ancients against the moderns, is, as we shall see, a favorite piece of tactics in this new style of apologetic. Whatever its value otherwise, it had at least one good result — it led to a much more zealous and assiduous study of Judaism than any purely scientific interest would have inspired. Converted Jews naturally made themselves serviceable in this new apologetic; they brought the knowledge with them, and in defending their new faith or assailing the old they were excusing their own apostasy and giving proof of a sincerity which was often suspected by both sides.

The earliest of this type which has been preserved is the Dialogue of Petrus Alfonsi (died 1110), physician to King Alfonso VI of Castile, who stood sponsor at his baptism (1106) — hence the name, “Alfonso’s Peter.” In his new character of Peter the Christian, the author confutes and eventually converts himself in his former quality of Moses the Jew. The argument is chiefly philosophical and biblical; Jewish lore is brought in principally by way of exposing to ridicule the absurdities of the Haggada, particularly its anthropomorphisms. Only rarely (e.g. on Gen. 49, 10) is Jewish interpretation alleged in confirmation of Christian.

Converts became more numerous in the thirteenth century.⁴ As the Christian kingdoms grew stronger and more secure, the policy of the government became more consistently unfavorable to the Jews, and the Church promoted these measures. At the same time the missionary efforts of the Dominican friars, whom Gregory IX (1227–1241) had particularly charged with this work, were prosecuted with persistent and well-directed zeal. Raymund de Pennafort (died January, 1275), the general of the order, sought to win Moslems and Jews to the catholic faith by conviction rather than to force them into

⁴ See below, note 21.

the church by persecution, and to this end established a college in which promising members of the order selected for the task studied the Arabic, Hebrew, and Aramaic languages, the Moslem and Jewish Scriptures, and their philosophical and theological literature. Among these students was Raimundus Martini, whose *Pugio Fidei* is the great monument of this endeavor. Of his life, a large part of which was passed in a convent of his order in Barcelona, little is chronicled. In 1264, in the sequel of the disputation at Barcelona in the preceding year before King James I of Aragon between the convert Pablo Christiani and Rabbi Moses ben Nahman,⁵ Martini was one of a commission appointed by the King to examine Jewish books, with instructions to expunge passages injurious to Christ or the Virgin Mary. He had thus the best imaginable opportunity to become acquainted with Jewish literature of all periods down to his own day, and to acquire copies. For the rest, we know that in 1278 he was in the midst of the second of the three parts into which his work is divided (II. x. 2, p. 316),⁶ and that he was still living in 1284.

The first of the three parts of the *Pugio* is a refutation of the errors of the philosophers, that is chiefly the Arab Aristotelians, whose three fundamental errors are that the world is eternal, that God's knowledge does not embrace particulars, and that there will never be a resurrection of the body. In these chapters he shows himself familiar with the Moslem authors and Arabic translations of the Greeks. Averroes, as might be supposed, is the most obnoxious of the philosophers; Algazel a welcome ally.

The second and third parts have to do with the Jews. In the former the proofs that the Messiah is already come are marshalled, and the contrary arguments of the Jews are combatted. The third part has three subdivisions (*distinctiones*). The first

⁵ An account of this discussion, written by R. Moses ben Nahman, may be found in Wagenseil, *Tela ignea Satanae*. The three subjects appointed to be debated were: Whether the Messiah has already appeared; Whether the Messiah of the prophets was divine or human; Whether Judaism or Christianity is the true religion. In the report we have, the controversy ends with the Trinity.

⁶ The year 1278 is often given inexactly as the year of the completion of the whole work.

deals with the unity of God and the distinction of persons in the Godhead; the second with man, the fall and its consequences; the third may be denominated Christology, closing with chapters on the rejection of the Jews and the ultimate conversion of the remnant. In the argument addressed to the Jews, Martini meets them on the ground of the Hebrew Bible, and quotes extensively from Jewish authorities. His quotations are given at large in the original, with exact references according to the method in use in his time, accompanied by a Latin translation and interpretation. The range of his learning is very wide; he quotes the Targums, both Talmuds, the Seder Olam, the various Midrashim which are commonly called Rabboth, the Midrash on Psalms, the Mekilta on Exodus, and others. Of commentators he uses Rashi (d. 1105), Ibn Ezra (d. 1167), David Kimchi (d. 1235), and his own contemporary R. Moses ben Nahman, and frequently cites the Moreh Nebukim of Maimonides (d. 1204). Some of the works from which he drew have perished and are known only through his excerpts; one such from which he frequently quotes was the Bereshith Rabbah attributed to R. Moses ha-Darshan, who flourished in Narbonne in the middle of the eleventh century.⁷ Mention may be made further of extracts from Josippon, and the Toledoth Yeshua. It is important to observe, on the other hand, that the Pugio contains no quotations from the Zohar or other cabalistic works. The Cabala had, in fact, made little headway in Spain against the current of Aristotelianism when Martini wrote, though Azriel, who is regarded as the founder of the speculative Cabala, belonged to the generation before him and Moses ben Nahman, who is said to have been inducted into the Cabala by Azriel, was his contemporary.

The Pugio is a controversial work, and the manners of serious theological controversy, one observes, are seldom perfectly

⁷ The texts as Martini quotes them sometimes differ materially from the manuscripts and printed editions in our hands, and his good faith has consequently been called in question. Where the text has really been tampered with in Christian interest, it is more likely that the copies he used had been interpolated by Jewish converts than that he falsified them himself. The judgment of recent Jewish critics is in general favorable to his honesty.

urbane; but it was composed for the purpose of converting Jews, not of vilifying them, and compared with much more recent anti-Judaic polemic it might almost be called gentlemanly, notwithstanding the suggestion of the assassin in the title. But its proper praise is that it is a genuine work of learning. In an order like the Dominicans, which counted among its members numerous Jewish converts, some of them men of rabbinical education, there were great possibilities of coöperative scholarship, and it is probable that Martini availed himself of them; but whatever assistance he may have had in gathering his material, it is evident that he had made it completely his own. The *Pugio* is not merely remarkable as a first enterprise; it still remains within its scope an admirable monument of erudition. A large part of what today constitutes the common stock of references in this field derives ultimately from Martini, though the source has long been forgotten, and not infrequently the references have got wrong in the long chain of borrowers borrowing from borrowers. Some characteristic examples of this will be given further on. In recent books the *Pugio* has a traditional place in the bibliography, but of first hand knowledge of it there is seldom any evidence.

Martini's work, in three great volumes, was in another sense too monumental. Copies of it are not, and probably never were, numerous. References to it in the following centuries are infrequent. Very early, however, a good deal of its contents was transferred to the pages of a handier book, the *Victoria* of Porchetus de Salvaticis, completed in 1303. The author, a Carthusian, native of Genoa, explains in the introduction that he names his work *Victoria, eo quod per eum Judaei facile convincuntur, ac eorum conscientiae non modicum penetrantur*. He acknowledges his obligation to Raymund Martini, *a quo sumpsit hujus libelli materiam in plerisque compilandi*. The long extracts from the rabbinical sources in the original Hebrew are omitted, and much besides which Porchetus evidently did not regard as essential to his purpose. On the other hand, Porchetus not infrequently introduces *de suo* matter not found in the *Pugio*, for example, a discussion of the pronunciation of the

Tetragrammaton (*Johouah*).⁸ Porchetus's *Victoria* was printed in Paris in 1520 under the editorial direction of A. Giustiniani, the first professor of Hebrew and Arabic in the university of Paris.⁹ It evidently had considerable circulation in its day; it is quoted, for example, by Luther, who in fact translated from it passages of some length in his pamphlet, *Vom Schem Hamephoras und vom Geschlecht Christi*, appended in the collective editions to his *Von den Juden und ihren Lügen* (both of the year 1543).

Two years before Giustiniani printed the *Victoria*, Petrus Galatinus, a Franciscan, with the encouragement of Pope Leo X and the Emperor Maximilian, published a folio volume under the title, *De arcanis catholicae veritatis*,¹⁰ the immediate motive of which was to support Reuchlin in his strife with the Dominicans about the books of the Jews¹¹ by showing that the distinctive doctrines of Christianity can be proved from these same books. The argument is conducted in the form of a discussion in which Reuchlin (Capnio), Hoogstraaten (Prior of the Dominicans in Cologne), and Galatinus himself take part; Galatinus being the chief speaker, Reuchlin the interrogator, who humbly sits at the feet of Galatinus, Hoogstraaten an occasional objector.

The resemblances between Galatinus and Porchetus were early remarked in a sense uncomplimentary to the former,¹² but it was left for Joseph Scaliger to discover that the *De Arcanis* was an enormous plagiarism from the *Pugio*, a manuscript of

⁸ On the pronunciation *Johouah* in Porchetus, see my Notes in *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, xxviii (October 1912), pp. 55-57, and on Luther's use of Porchetus, *ibid.*, pp. 60 f.

⁹ See Appendix, p. 254.

¹⁰ See Appendix, p. 254.

¹¹ The Dominicans, instigated by a baptized Jew named Pfefferkorn, had got from the emperor in 1508 an edict that the Jews should deliver all their books to be examined, and that such as contained things injurious to the Christian religion should be burned. The emperor was induced to reconsider this action, and called upon Reuchlin for an expert opinion as a Hebraist and a jurist. In his report Reuchlin distinguished seven classes of Jewish books, of which at the outside only one, such scandalous writings as the *Toledoth Jeshua*, and direct attacks on Christianity like the *Nissahon*, merited destruction. Thereupon he himself became the object of a venomous attack.

¹² E.g. by Jean Morin, *Exercitationes Biblicae*, lib. i, exerc. 1, c. 1 (p. 9 f.), 1660.

which he had seen twenty years before in a library in Toulouse.¹³ In fact, though the plan and disposition are different, most of the learning in the Arcana was conveyed direct from Martini. The critical comparison made by the Dominican editors of the Pugio a half century later gave an exhaustive demonstration of the Franciscan's fraud; the long annals of literary theft record no more egregious case. The numerous material additions in Galatinus are chiefly cabalistic, derived from the Zohar and other supposititious writings of Simeon ben Yohai. He also quotes frequently from a work called *Gale Razaia* (Revealer of Mysteries) which professed to have for its author no less a person than R. Judah ha-Kadosh. Though more than one book bearing the same title (from Dan. 2, 29) is recorded by bibliographers, Galatinus's is none of them, and it has even been suspected that the alleged quotations from it were a pure fabrication of Galatinus himself, who was presumably as capable of inventing fictitious sources as of concealing real ones.¹⁴ The suspicion does him no injustice, though it perhaps overrates his creative imagination, but in this case it is erroneous. The real author was Pablo de Heredia (d. 1486), a Spanish Jew, who signalized his conversion to Christianity by a series of impudent forgeries.¹⁵

Large as was Galatinus's surreptitious conveyance of learning from the Pugio, the purpose and plan of the Arcana are very different. The primary object of Galatinus, as has been already remarked, was to uphold the cause of Reuchlin against the Dominicans; Hoogstraaten is throughout the opponent whose attack on the whole Jewish literature is to be repelled. Galatinus does not, however, confine himself to that task. When he takes upon him to prove in long discussion (Book vii) the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary against Hoogstraaten and Hoogstraaten's authority, Aquinas, he is prosecuting the long-standing controversy of his order with the Do-

¹³ In letters to Casaubon, August, 1603, May, 1604; see Carpzov's edition of the Pugio, pp. 106 f. Scaliger erroneously supposed that the author was Raymundus Sebon.

¹⁴ Morin broadly hints as much; and a half century earlier the elder Buxtorf wrote: Galatino saepissime hic liber laudatus et citatus, de cujus fide multi dubitant.

¹⁵ A note on Heredia's fabrications will appear in another number of the Review.

minicans, and his occasional quotations from (spurious) Jewish writings hardly suffice for a pretext. In the two centuries and more between Martini and Galatinus both Christian theology and Jewish polemic had brought new points into prominence, as may be seen in the chapters on the Mother of the Messiah. The Arcana is adapted to a new situation.

Galatinus's Arcana was several times reprinted (Basel 1591, Frankfurt 1603, 1612, 1672), and many who came after him derived much of their learning directly or indirectly from it.

The Pugio itself was first printed in 1651.¹⁶ It had waited long, but had the good fortune at last to fall into hands worthy of the task. The names of those who in different ways encouraged or furthered the enterprise are recorded on the title-page, and their respective parts in it defined in the ample prefatory matter. The principal editor, Joseph Voisin,¹⁷ not only collated four manuscripts for the text, but appended to the several chapters of the second and third parts *Observationes* containing additional quotations from the sources employed by Martini and from later authors, including some from the Zohar and cabalistic commentators such as Behai, notes on differences between the text of the Talmud and other books as adduced in the Pugio and the current printed editions — differences in part accounted for by the subsequent activities of the censorship — and the like. To Martini's *Proemium* Voisin attached, at a length of nearly a hundred and fifty folios, prolegomena, treating first of the *Lex non scripta* and the whole subject of Jewish tradition, including a complete analysis of the Mishna; the thirteen norms of halakic deduction; on the Talmuds, Midrashim, and commentators, with a short chapter on the Cabala, etc.; then of the *Lex scripta* and its contents; the commandments, positive and negative; the divisions of the Pentateuch; the rules for copying the Scriptures and the defects which render a copy unfit for use; the disputed question of the age of the vowel points; the canon, and the authorship of the several books according to Jewish tradition; on Hebrew poetry; the lections from the Prophets and the

¹⁶⁻¹⁷ See Appendix, p. 254.

divisions (*sedarim*) of the prophetic books; the translations of the Old Testament, etc. Particular note may be made of an extensive collection of quotations from the Old Testament (arranged in the order of their occurrence in the New) which were interpreted by the Jews in a way similar to the interpretation and application given them in the New Testament, and rabbinical parallels to New Testament ideas and expressions — a precursor, in a limited field, of the *Horae Hebraicae* of succeeding scholars.

Voisin's account of Jewish teaching and opinion is compiled, with large quotations in Hebrew and translation, from the best reputed authors, including Maimonides (*Mishneh Torah* and *Moreh*), Joseph Albo (*Ikkarim*), Azariah de Rossi (*Meor Enayim*). The whole is a work of admirable learning, and a most useful introduction to Martini. The greater part of it might still be studied with profit by many who profess to write on the subject in the light of "the attainment of modern research"; incidentally they might learn how a genuine scholar does his work. Voisin's edition of the *Pugio* was reprinted in Germany in 1687 under the direction of Johann Benedict Carpzov (the second of the name; died 1699), Professor in Leipzig, who prefixed to it a long *Introductio in Theologiam Judaicam et lectionem Raimundi, aliorumque id genus auctorum*. The author's attitude toward his subject is illustrated by the title of one of his subdivisions: *Theologiae Judaicae modernae Auctor principalis, Satanas; Ministerialis, Rabbinus*. Nevertheless — probably by some oversight of Satan — even in it, he admits, there are vestiges of the true doctrine of the Old Testament which may be turned against the Jews; such were collected in the *Pugio*, whose author, *refutandam sibi caeteroqui proposuit theologiam Judaicam modernorum, apostatarum, reprobatorum, excoecatorum*, etc. It is this edition that is commonly in the hands of scholars; Voisin's is seldom found.

New and welcome sources were opened to Christian apologists in the Cabala, which purported to be an esoteric tradition of immemorial antiquity.¹⁸ The eccentric genius Raymond Lull (died 1315) was the first Christian scholar whose

¹⁸ See L. Ginzberg, 'Cabala,' *Jewish Encyclopedia*, ii, 456-479.

writings give evidence of acquaintance with the Cabala, but he employed his knowledge chiefly in his great scheme for a new science. It was two centuries later before the vogue of the Cabala in Christian circles began. Pico della Mirandola (died 1494) took it up with enthusiasm. He found in it a philosophy which he easily identified with his own Neoplatonic ideas, coming with the authority of revelation; it contained all the distinctive doctrines of Christianity: "The mystery of the Trinity, the incarnation of the Word, the divinity of the Messiah, original sin and its expiation through Christ, the heavenly Jerusalem, the fall of demons, the orders of angels, purgatory, and the punishment of hell." And all this in an esoteric tradition which, preserved among the Jews for many centuries orally, was reduced to writing by Ezra! It thus not only offered confirmation of the Christian faith, but enabled its defenders to confound the cavils of the Jews by the authority of their own books: "There is hardly a point in controversy between us and the Jews on which they cannot be so refuted out of the books of the cabalists that there will not be a corner left for them to hide in."¹⁹ Reuchlin (died 1522), whose interest in cabalistic studies had been awakened by Pico during a temporary residence in Florence in 1490, entertained a similar estimate of the Cabala, both the speculative and the practical branches of which, in his view, centered in the doctrine of the Messiah. Of Galatinus, what is necessary has been said above.

From this time on the Cabala has a prominent place in Christian apologetic and anti-Judaic polemic, taking its place beside, or before, the testimonies from the Targum, Talmud and Midrash, and Jewish commentators and philosophers, such as Raymund Martini had adduced. The first introduction of Christian scholars to cabalistic literature was through recent authors like Recanati (flor. ca. 1300), whose commentary on the Pentateuch Pico della Mirandola translated into Latin, and Bahya ben Asher (Behai; died 1340); but students soon found their way to the Zohar, which passed for the highest authority in this sphere. The Zohar, in form a Midrash on the Pentateuch, professed to be the secret instruction imparted by R. Simeon

¹⁹ *De hominis dignitate* (ed. Basel 1592), pp. 329 f.

ben Yohai to a select circle of disciples, Simeon himself having received the doctrine by revelation. Whatever reservations Christian scholars may have made on the point of Simeon's inspiration, they did not doubt the age or the authenticity of the Zohar; nor that in substance it perpetuated a tradition much more ancient than the time of its reputed author, the middle of the second century of our era. Indeed, the great antiquity of the cabalistic tradition has been maintained by some orthodox Protestant theologians as late as the middle of the nineteenth century.²⁰ What could be accomplished in the way of proving Christian dogmas from the Zohar is well exemplified by G. C. Sommer, *Specimen Theologiae Soharaicae cum Christiana amice convenientis, exhibens articulorum fidei fundamentalium probationes, e Sohare, . . . petitas*, etc. (1734), in which a complete system of orthodox Protestant doctrine, formulated in twenty 'theses,' is established, article by article, by *loca probantia* from the Zohar instead of the Bible, the extracts being duly exhibited in the original and translation, with explanatory and illustrative commentary.

The exchange of polemics between Jews and Christians increased in volume and violence in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, not alone in Spain, where converted Jews demonstrated their zeal for their new faith by the vehemence with which they impugned the old, and provoked equally vehement replies, but in France and Germany.²¹ The replies did not restrict themselves to the defense of Judaism against its assailants, or to a refutation by exegetical and historical arguments of the Christian interpretation and application of the Old Testament, or to disputing the doctrines of the church on rational or philosophical grounds, but directed their criticism against the Gospels and other books of the New Testament, with which the authors show themselves well acquainted. An indication of the temper in which some of them were written is given by the title *Niṣṣaḥon*, 'Triumph,' which more than

²⁰ Notably Tholuck and Hengstenberg.

²¹ The most prominent of the Spanish converts were Abner of Burgos (Alfonso of Valladolid, or of Burgos), died ca. 1350; Solomon ha-Levi of Burgos (Paul de Santa Maria, or Paul of Burgos), died 1345; Joshua ben Joseph ha-Lorki (Geronimo de Santa Fe), body physician of Pope Benedict XIII.

one of them bears, precisely as Porchetus had named his book 'Victoria.'

One of these Triumphs, the work of an unknown author who appears to have lived in the Rhineland, perhaps at Speier, in the thirteenth century,²² gives considerable space to an examination in detail of passages from the Gospels, beginning with the genealogy of Jesus in Matt. 1, and its conflict with the genealogy in Luke. The writer is familiar with the Vulgate, whose words he frequently quotes in Latin (done into Hebrew letters) and sometimes criticizes its renderings of the Old Testament. Another work under the same title was written by R. Lipmann-Mühlhausen, about the beginning of the fifteenth century. Its author, who also was well acquainted with the Latin Bible, offers a detailed refutation of Christianity, divided into paragraphs, three hundred and forty-eight in number, each of which begins with a passage from the Old Testament. A compendious answer in poetical form to the Christian contentions and a summary of Jewish polemic is prefixed. In the *Hizzuk Emunah* of the Karaite Isaac Troki (died 1594),²³ the argument ranges over the whole of the New Testament, from Matthew to Revelation, and is always on the offensive. The polemic is of a completely modern type, and the change of the times is evident also in the fact that the book was not only widely circulated in the original Hebrew but was translated into modern languages. The growing aggressiveness of the Jewish controversialists was met in a like spirit by those who hastened to defend Christianity and repel the calumnies of the Jews. To expose these 'calumnies' they printed the Jewish polemic treatises with Latin translations, comments, and refutations, thus ensuring their preservation and wider publicity, in the act of exciting prejudice against the Jews.

Wagenseil, who published a thick volume of such texts (including the *Toledoth Jeshua*) and replies, gave it the significant title *Tela ignea Satanae*, The Fiery Darts of the Evil One (1681). Wagenseil's principal 'Confutatio' is annexed to the

²² Commonly cited as *Nizzachon Vetus*, to distinguish it from the work of Lipmann-Mühlhausen. Printed in Wagenseil.

²³ Troki's work is also in Wagenseil.

little Carmen Memoriale prefixed to Lipmann's Nissahon. The poem itself, if printed solid, would hardly fill more than a page or two; the reply occupies 413 pages in quarto. The author takes up Lipmann's twelve issues of controversy — chiefly Messianic — article by article and almost word by word, going into detailed discussion especially of Messianic prophecies, such as Gen. 49, 10 (63 pages), Isaiah 7, 14 (47 pages), etc., and incorporates long extracts from other authors, e.g. Amyraldus on the proof of the Trinity from the Old Testament, Chrysostom on the vain attempts of the Jews to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem, a catalogue of false Messiahs from the *Shalsheleth ha-Kabbala*, several specimens of Jewish synagogue sermons (in German), an epistolary altercation in Hebrew between Rittangel (d. 1652) and a Jew, Jewish computations of the time of the future advent of the Messiah, and the like (also from the *Shalsheleth ha-Kabbala*). The Toledoth Jeshua is also honored with a lengthy refutation; and the volume closes with a Mantissa on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel, directed against the recent interpretation of the English scholar, John Marsham. Nor should the hundred pages of formidably learned preliminaries be ignored.

Still more violent against the Jews and everything Jewish is Eisenmenger's *Entdecktes Judenthum* (1700, 2 vols.).²⁴ It is a malignant book, if ever there was one, but it is doubtful whether any man ever gave himself so much pains to gratify his malignancy. The book describes itself, in a title-page as long as a modern preface, as a "thorough and truthful account of the way in which the hardened Jews horribly blaspheme and dishonor the most holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, defame the holy Mother of Christ, jeer and scoff at the New Testament, the Evangelists and Apostles, the Christian religion, and utterly despise and curse all Christian people," etc. The author promises to expose, besides, the gross errors of Jewish

²⁴ On the complaint of the Jews, this first edition of Eisenmenger's book was suppressed by the emperor as prejudicial to public order (see Wolf, ii, 1024). It was reprinted under the auspices of Frederick I, King of Prussia, and published in 1711, at Königsberg (or Berlin; see Wolf as above), in two volumes quarto, together nearly 2200 pages. A facsimile of the title page and other information about the work will be found in the Jewish Encyclopedia, v, 80 f.

religion and theology, together with its ridiculous fables and other absurdities — all this by extracts in their own words from their own books, of which he had read through a great many, “mit grosser Mühe und unverdrossenem Fleiss.” To give him his due, he had read prodigiously. The annotated bibliography of Hebrew books from which his quotations are taken, prefixed to the first volume, fills more than fifteen quarto pages, besides a page about writings in Jewish-German; it enumerates substantially all the works of any consequence that might have been registered in a catalogue of *Rabbinica et Judaica* at the end of the seventeenth century, and the extracts in the two volumes prove that the bibliography is not a parade. His quotations are given in Hebrew with a German translation and exact references. Some of the chapters, especially in the second volume, in which he undertakes to set forth the beliefs of the Jews on such subjects as paradise, hell, angels, devils, the Messiah, the duration of his reign and what comes after it, the resurrection and judgment, though never losing sight of the polemic intent, are more constructive presentations of Jewish teaching, and contain a vast mass of quotations from literature of all ages. For reference on particular topics the volumes are furnished with ample and excellent analytical indexes.

The author shared with the scholars of his age, Jewish and Christian, the belief in the antiquity and authority of the Cabala, and quotes it extensively, especially in the writings of its later representatives, including not only Luria and Cordovero but the *Yalkut Rubeni* of his own contemporary Reuben Hoshke (d. 1673). Eisenmenger is the notorious source of almost every thing that has been written since his time in defamation of the Talmud or in derision of Jewish superstitions, and abounds in accusation of all kinds of misdeeds perpetrated against Christians, including the murder of children to use their blood in unholy rites.²⁵ What modern writers retail about the irreverence or childishness of the Jewish imagination of God — for example, God as a Rabbi, studying and teaching the law — comes ultimately from Eisenmenger, who fills sixty pages with the like edifying matter. It is not so frequently

²⁵ Vol. ii, pp. 220 ff.

recognized how deeply his successors have been indebted to the less strident parts of his work; and, with all his prejudice, what he adduces from the rabbinical sources is much more trustworthy than the books on which recent scholars have chiefly depended.

The Reformation gave a motive of its own to rabbinical studies. Hitherto scholars had maintained the doctrines of the Catholic Church against the Jews, or tried to convert Jews to them, and in so doing strove to confirm the Christian interpretation and application of the Old Testament by arraying on their side the most highly reputed Jewish authorities against the modern Jews. Protestants, on the other hand, in rejecting the authority of the Church and its traditions, took upon themselves to build up the entire edifice of Christian doctrine upon a purely scriptural basis. They were thus under the necessity of treating constructively various topics which had long been issues in controversy with the Jews, and of correlating them to other parts of the system. A great deal of the old material that had come down through centuries of polemics was ready to their hand, but for the new use it had to be put together in a new way; and when it came to be thus put together gaps were disclosed which had to be filled up. There was, moreover, at many points a distinctively Protestant position to be maintained against the Catholic interpretation and dogma.

To meet this need a multitude of monographs were written which may be regarded as materials for Protestant dogmatics. Like the Catholic works of the same period they illustrate the progress that has been made since the close of the fifteenth century in biblical philology, and the authors of many of them, whether Lutheran or Reformed, were largely learned at first hand in Jewish literature, both rabbinical and cabalistic. Their use of this material is, from our point of view, uncritical, but the collections are in some cases almost exhaustive so far as the sources were at hand, and no one who today undertakes a study of the subjects they treated can afford to ignore them, or can employ them without mingling admiration with gratitude.

Nor should we do justice to the literature of that age if we failed to recognize in much of it, along with the dogmatic and

polemic motive, the scholar's love of learning for its own sake, above all its uses. This is still more conspicuous in the works that deal not strictly with doctrine, but with religious and civil institutions in Bible times and later; with the temple, priesthood, cultus; the synagogue and its worship; with proselytes to Judaism; or with civil government, the laws, courts, and administration of justice; with marriage and divorce, education, and many subjects beside, in most of which Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah* with its commentaries served them admirably for an introduction. The same spirit is manifest in works on the topography of Palestine, on the zoölogy and botany of the Bible, on its chronology, and the like, in all of which fields the permanent monographs come from this period. A perennial monument of the learning of that age is Surenhusius' edition of the *Mishna* (1698-1703), in six folio volumes, with Latin translation of the text and the most approved Jewish commentaries, together with additional comments and notes by Christian scholars, and extensive indexes, enabling the student to acquaint himself directly with this primary legal authority. Translations were also made of numerous treatises of the *Talmud*, and of the ancient juristic *Midrash*. Many of these were published, together with reprints of most of the seventeenth century works on Jewish antiquities, in the enormous collection of Blaisio Ugolino, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum*, 34 volumes in folio, 1744-1769.

Rabbinical learning was put to a different use when it was employed to elucidate or illustrate the New Testament. This was often done sporadically in continuous commentaries, e.g. by Grotius, and by Drusius in his *Praeterita*. Subsequently works were composed which might be described as rabbinical glosses on the New Testament, in which, generally without any other commentary, single passages were annotated with pertinent quotations from rabbinical sources. One of the earliest of these was the *Mellificium Hebraicum* (1649) of Christopher Cartwright,²⁶ which glosses in this way not only the New Testa-

²⁶ Christopher Cartwright (1602-1658) is the author also of *Electa Thargumico-Rabbinica, sive Annotationes in Exodum ex triplici Thargum seu Chaldaica paraphrasi*, 1658. The *Mellificium Hebraicum, seu Observationes Diversimodae ex Hebraeorum*,

ment but the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, besides two books (iv and v) of more miscellaneous adversaria. The second and third books, on the New Testament, quote with especial frequency parallels from the exegetical and homiletic Midrashim, particularly the Rabboth.

To the compilers of such glosses, as indeed to all who worked in this field then or since, the elder Buxtorf's *Lexicon Chaldaicum Talmudicum et Rabbinicum*, published by his son in 1640, was of inestimable value. Based on the *Aruk* of R. Nathan ben Jehiel of Rome (died 1106), but with much additional matter, especially for the language of the Targums, in which he had a predecessor in Elias Levita (*Meturgeman*, 1541), and the Hebrew of mediaeval authors and commentators; the Zohar also is frequently cited. Some of the articles are virtual concordances; he quotes, for example, all the occurrences of the word 'Messiah' in the Targums. In view of the ingratitude of most of the learned to the dictionaries which supply them with so much of their learning, it enhances our respect for Cartwright that he so often gives credit to Buxtorf, even when he supplements the dictionary references or corrects them. The *Mellificium*, which seems to be quite unknown to modern writers, is a useful complement to Lightfoot and Schoettgen, because its parallels are so largely drawn from the Palestinian Midrashim in which the author had evidently read extensively. When it is added that it covers not only the Gospels, but the Acts, Epistles, and Revelation, sufficient reason has perhaps been given for reviving the memory of the learned Christopher Cartwright.

The best known work of this class is the *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* of John Lightfoot. Only the parts on the Gospels and First Corinthians were published by the author;²⁷ Acts is posthumous, and Romans a fragment from Lightfoot's notes. To each of the Gospels is prefixed a discussion of regions and

praesertim antiquorum, monumentis desumptae, unde plurima cum Veteris tum Novi Testamenti loca vel explicantur, vel illustrantur etc., was printed in the *Critici Sacri*, (London, 1660), ix, cols. 2943-3128.

²⁷ The parts of Lightfoot's *Horae* were published separately, Matthew 1658, Mark 1663, 1 Corinthians 1664, John 1671, Luke 1674, Acts and Romans, posthumously, 1678, by Richard Kidder.

places named in the Gospel, particularly in the light of descriptions or references in the Talmud, and these chorographic studies fill a considerable part of the volume — a partial precursor of the great work of Adrian Reland, *Palaestina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata* (1714). Unlike Cartwright, Lightfoot's chief sources are the two Talmuds, with which he frequently quotes Rashi and the Tosaphoth. Maimonides also is often cited, and the commentators on the Old Testament; his lexical authority is the Aruk. On points of especial interest the glossarial method gives place to an excursus, sometimes of considerable length, for example, on Jewish baptism, the sects, synagogues, Sanhedrin, the Passover ritual, and the like. Numerous obscurities in the Greek are cleared up by comparison with Hebrew or Aramaic idiom; a good example is the wholly unintelligible ὁψὲ δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, ἦλθε Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ, κ.τ.λ. (Matt. 28.1). Some modern commentators and critics might have made sense out of the verse and understood its relation to the parallels (Mark 16, 1; Luke 24, 1) if the horizon of their learning had been wide enough to take in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.²⁸

The *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae in universum Novum Testamentum* of Christian Schoettgen (1733), is described on the title page and in the preface as a supplement to Lightfoot on the Gospels, and for the rest of the New Testament a continuation of that scholar's unfinished work. Appended to the volume are seven short dissertations on various topics, such as the Kingdom of Heaven,²⁹ the celestial Jerusalem in Jewish

²⁸ See Schmiedel, *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, iv, col. 4041 f., cf. 4072; and on the passage, Moore in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, xxvi (1906), 323-329.

²⁹ A slip of Schoettgen's in the first paragraph of the *Dissertatio de Regno Coelorum* (i, 1147) is probably the origin of a misstatement which runs through a whole procession of New Testament lexicons and commentaries, namely that ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν in Matthew corresponds to מַלְכוּת הַשָּׁמַיִם in rabbinical Hebrew. Schoettgen expressly says so; but if the scholars who took his word for it had looked at the examples he quotes in the following pages and elsewhere (on Matt. 11, 19, p. 115 f.), or at those collected by Lightfoot on Matt. 3, 2, they would have discovered that the rabbinical phrase is always מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם, which Lightfoot correctly explained as by metonymy for God. The solitary instance of הַשָּׁמַיִם in Schoettgen (p. 116), 'Mekilta in Yalkut Rubeni fol. 176, 4,' is an error either in Yalkut Rubeni (1660) or more probably in Schoettgen himself; the Mekilta (Jethro, Par. 5, init. on Exod. 20, 2) has correctly שָׁמַיִם.

representation, and on Christ the greatest of Rabbis. One of them entitled 'De Exergasia Sacra,' observations on parallelism in Hebrew style, is an interesting anticipation of Lowth's theory of Hebrew poetry, published twenty years later. Schoettgen's reading, according to his preface and a *Conspectus Autorum* appended to it, was more extensive than Lightfoot's. He includes the *Zohar* (through Knorr von Rosenroth's *Kabbala Denudata*), and several cabalistic works, from Behai (Bahya ben Asher) down to the *Yalkut Rubeni*. In 1742 Schoettgen published a second volume, also under the title *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, but with the more specific description, 'in *Theologiam Judaeorum dogmaticam antiquam et orthodoxam de Messia.*' This portly monograph of more than 700 pages in quarto, with a pair of dissertations added, and an appendix on rabbinical literature and other things, bringing the whole up to a round thousand pages, is not, as the uninitiated reader would gather from the title page, and as the author doubtless in good faith believed, an exposition of the *locus de Messia* in the 'ancient and orthodox dogmatic theology of the Jews' — something that never existed — but an attempt to prove that the whole orthodox dogmatic Christology of the church was held by the Jews at the beginning of our era and taught in their ancient and authoritative books, exoteric as well as esoteric.

As in all similar demonstrations, the Cabala has to furnish the evidence; and Schoettgen is so fully convinced of the Christianity of the *Zohar* that he sets himself seriously to prove that its supposed author, R. Simeon ben Yohai, was himself a Christian (pp. 901–917). This thesis was controverted by Justus Glaesener (himself the author of a *Theologia Soharica*) in a *Diatribē* reprinted in Schoettgen (pp. 918–935), to which Schoettgen replies in defense his theory (*ibid.* pp. 935–949). What did more lasting mischief than all this cabalistic Christianity in Schoettgen and others was the fact that upon its presumptions the genuine rabbinical sources were interpreted by the Cabala, with which they were assumed to be in complete accord — only, as was natural in esoteric writings, intimating its sublime doctrines more obscurely, and in language the full meaning of which was comprehended only by those who

had the cabalistic key. Since the middle of the last century the Cabala has ceased to be quoted as an exponent of Jewish teaching at the beginning of our era, but in more modern expositions of this teaching — on the nature and office of the so-called intermediaries in Jewish theology, for example — the rabbinical texts in Targums, Talmud, and Midrash are still interpreted in unconscious dependence on a cabalistic tradition.

One more volume, nearly contemporaneous with Schoettgen's *Horae*, demands a brief mention, namely, Joh. Gerhard Meuschen, *Novum Testamentum ex Talmude et antiquitatibus Hebraeorum illustratum* (1736). This is a collection of writings, partly *inedita*, by several authors, Meuschen's own contributions being only the preface and a diatribe on the Nasi, or Director of the great Sanhedrin. The first place in the volume (pp. 1-232) is taken by Balthasar Scheid, *Praeterita Praetertorum*, illustrations of select passages in the New Testament, chiefly from the Babylonian Talmud, somewhat resembling Lightfoot, but with fewer mere glosses, and in general with fuller comment on the texts under consideration. At the beginning, Scheid collects and remarks briefly on the Talmudic passages in which there is mention of Jesus and his disciples, an anticipation of which recent writers on the subject seem not to be aware. Nearly 800 pages are occupied by dissertations, programmes, etc., by Johann Andreas Danz (died 1727). Danz was one of the foremost Hebraists of his age, and these writings, when occasion requires, show him widely read also in classical and patristic literature. Whatever subjects he takes up are discussed with exhaustive thoroughness, whether it be proselyte baptism in relation to the baptism of John, or the law of *talio*, or Jewish excommunication (to illustrate Matt. 18, 18), or the idea of redemption (1 Pet. 1, 18 f.). Particular attention may be called to the series of programmes on the Shekinah (on John 14, 23). Among the other contents of the volume may be noted the controversy between Rhenferd and Witsius on the phrase 'the World to Come' in the Jewish literature and the New Testament, the particular point at issue being whether *עולם הבא* is equivalent to the 'Days of the Messiah,' which Rhenferd disproves.

Wettstein, in his edition of the New Testament (1751, 1752, 2 vols. fol.), subjoined to the text and critical apparatus a *commentarius plenior*, illustrating *ex scriptoribus veteribus Hebraeis, Graecis et Latinis historiam et vim verborum*. For the illustrations from Greek and Latin authors, besides his own reading, Wettstein availed himself of the ample accumulations of such matter in commentators like Drusius, Grotius, and others; those from the Talmud and other rabbinical sources are derived chiefly from the works which have been described above, especially from those in glossarial form such as Lightfoot and Schoettgen. It was chiefly in Wettstein's convenient delectus, that these parallels and illustrations were used by subsequent commentators and theologians, and passed into a secondary tradition which in the course of repetition has forgotten its origins.

II. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT TIME

The seventeenth century was the great age of Hebrew learning among Christian scholars; it lasted on till toward the middle of the eighteenth and then abruptly ended. The works of that period embody the results of earlier researches in Jewish literature from Raymund Martini down, with large additions accumulated by the labors of later generations, both in rabbinic and cabalistic sources. To the apparatus then collected little has been added since. When, after a long interruption, a few scholars in the nineteenth century took up again the study of Judaism it was with a different end and with a correspondingly different method. These later authors would have described their aim as historical — to exhibit the beliefs and teachings of Judaism in New Testament times or in the early centuries of the Christian era. For this purpose they employed chiefly the material that came down from their predecessors, without giving sufficient consideration to the fact that it had been gathered for every conceivable motive except to serve as material for the historian.

The apologetic selections were confined to certain topics of Christian doctrine; a delectus of quotations made for a polemic purpose is the last kind of a source to which a historian would

go to get a just notion of what a religion really was to its adherents. Moreover, apologetic and polemic are addressed to contemporaries, and draw their proofs indifferently from past and present; if they appeal to the past against the present, it is the authority of antiquity they seek, not the history of doctrine. It may be possible to order their selections from the sources chronologically, and then to assign them to their proper age, but not to supply from such collections those sides of the religion which they ignore. The more constructive works, particularly of the seventeenth century, are contributions to Christian — specifically Protestant — theology, to which the exposition of Jewish teaching is incidental. The rabbinical glosses to the New Testament, finally, were never intended to represent the Judaism of New Testament times, but to illustrate passages in the Gospels and other books by parallels from Jewish literature, in the same way in which Grotius and others illustrate the same books and often the same passages by a redundancy of quotations from Greek and Latin authors. Least of all did Cartwright or Lightfoot and the rest dream that their illustrations would be used by moderns to explain the *origin* of New Testament ideas. A striking example of such misuse of their collections is given by a whole succession of commentaries on 1 Cor. 15, 45, where it is said that the identification of the 'second Adam' with the Messiah was commonly made by the Rabbis in Paul's time, from whom he had doubtless learned it. This probably got into the exegetical tradition through Schoettgen, who gives (after Edzard) the reference '*Neve Schalom* fol. 160 a.' The author of the book cited died in 1492, and no older reference has been adduced. It may be presumed that Schoettgen was aware of the age of the work; those who quote him seem to imagine that a book with a Hebrew title must be as old as Paul.³⁰

The modern period in Christian studies of Judaism begins with August Friedrich Gfroerer,³¹ *Geschichte des Urchristen-*

³⁰ See my note in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xvi (1897), 158-161; Fr. Schiele, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* xlii (1899), 20 ff.

³¹ August Friedrich Gfroerer (1803-1861) studied theology in Tübingen, 1821-1825, and was Repetent there in 1828. In 1830 he became librarian in Stuttgart, and from 1846 was professor of history in the university of Freiburg in Baden.

thums, the first part of which, under the title, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie, oder vom Einflusse der jüdisch-ägyptischen Schule auf die Lehre des Neuen Testaments* (2 vols.), appeared in 1831. This was followed by *Das Jahrhundert des Heils* (2 vols. 1838); *Die heilige Sage* (on the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, 2 vols); and *Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit* (on the Gospel of John; all in 1838). The sub-title of his Philo propounds the thesis of the whole work. The first volume is an exposition of the philosophy and theology, or as Gfroerer prefers to call it, 'theosophy,' of Philo, which is of independent and permanent worth; in the second he undertakes to demonstrate, chiefly from the Apocrypha, that the principal features of Philo's theology are much older than his time and had long been current among the Alexandrian Jews, and to show how this theosophy was transplanted to Palestine through the Therapeutae, Essenes, and other sects. The two volumes of the *Jahrhundert des Heils* (together nearly 900 pages) might more descriptively be entitled *The Theology of the Palestinian Jews at the Beginning of the Christian Era*. As we have already seen, the author holds that this theology — or at least what, in distinction from popular notions, may be called the *higher* theology — was nothing else than the Alexandrian 'theosophy,' which, early introduced in Palestine, had taken firm root there and flourished greatly. The Cabala is a product of the mystical philosophy of the Palestinian schools; but Gfroerer was convinced that the same philosophy is represented in the Targums, and many passages in the Talmud and Midrash.

In the preface Gfroerer acknowledges his indebtedness to earlier scholars from Raymund Martini down, naming among others Surenhusius, Rhenferd, Voisin, and Eisenmenger, and for the Cabala, Knorr von Rosenroth. Where translations of Talmudic texts were accessible, he availed himself of them and often quotes them in Latin. In his own reading in the Talmud and Zohar he had the help of Jewish scholars, who served him also in the collection of passages. Thus, without any pretence of great rabbinical learning, Gfroerer was respectably equipped for the task he set himself.

In the first chapter he gives a sufficient account of the rabbinical sources, discussing the age of the Talmud, and for the dates of the rest following the then recent critical work of Zunz.³² It should be remarked that, notwithstanding his prepossessions about the antiquity of the cabalistic theosophy, Gfroerer assigns the Zohar itself to the end of the thirteenth century. He believed, however, that the theosophy of the Zohar was far older than the book, which was only the literary precipitate of a secular tradition; and when he found the same ideas in Jewish writings from the first four centuries of our era, he felt warranted in quoting the Zohar as a representative of the ancient mystical doctrine of the Jews. It is a notable step in advance that Gfroerer includes among the sources for Palestinian Judaism in this period the writings collected by Fabricius in the *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (1713), among which are the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Psalms of Solomon, and gives especial attention to the Apocalypses, the Ethiopic Enoch and the Ascension of Isaiah, which had recently been brought to light,³³ and Fourth Esdras, the origin and age of all of which he submits to a critical discussion. In the heresies of Simon Magus and Elxai, and in the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, which he calls a Greek Zohar, he finds further sources for the history of Jewish theology, and cites many passages from the Fathers in attestation.

One of the results of this widening of the scope of the inquiry is the discrimination of different types of Jewish doctrine concerning the Messiah and the last things. One of these, drawn from the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, he calls the common prophetic type; the second is the Danielic type — we should say the apocalyptic — the Messiah the Son of Man who comes from heaven; the third is named the Mosaic type, because the Messiah is conceived as the prophet like unto Moses

³² Leopold Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt*. 1832.

³³ The Ethiopic text of the Ascension was edited, with Latin and English translations, by Richard Laurence in 1819; the Latin translation was reprinted by Gfroerer in *Prophetæ veteres pseudepigraphi*, 1840; Enoch in English translation by Laurence in 1821; the Ethiopic text in 1838.

of Deut. 18, 15; and finally, 'the mystical Mosaic type.'³⁴ The sharp distinction between the prophetic and apocalyptic forms of Messianic expectation, with the corresponding differences in the whole Jewish eschatology, put all these problems in a new light, and this chapter of Gfroerer's work had considerable influence on the further study of the subject.

Gfroerer had been a student at Tübingen under Ferdinand Christian Baur, to whom his *Philo* was dedicated. What he proposed was a history of primitive Christianity, and he addressed himself to the task with the spirit and method of a historian. The investigation of Alexandrian Judaism in the *Philo* and of Palestinian Judaism in the *Jahrhundert des Heils* was necessary, because only through a knowledge of contemporary Judaism can the beginnings of Christianity be historically understood. The author knew, however, that to have its full value for this ulterior purpose the investigation must be pursued without reference to it, and consequently *Das Jahrhundert des Heils* taken by itself is a history of Palestinian Judaism in New Testament times. It was the first time that the attempt had been made to portray Judaism as it was, from its own literature, without apologetic, polemic, or dogmatic prepossessions or intentions; and however greatly the Alexandrian influence in Palestinian theology is exaggerated, and whatever its shortcomings in other respects, this fact alone is enough to make the work memorable.

Gfroerer does not try to run Jewish teaching into the mould of any system of Christian theology, but adopts a disposition natural to the matter. After the chapter on the sources of which mention has already been made, and one on education and the learned class, he discusses the Jewish doctrine of revelation; the idea of God; the divine powers; the intermediaries between God and the world (*Shekinah*, *Memra*); angels and demons; creation, the world and its parts; man, the soul, immortality, freedom and destiny, sin, the fall; the means and ways by which man gains the favor of God or averts his wrath; God's purpose with the Jewish people, providence; this world and that to come; the time of the Messiah's advent; and

³⁴ *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii, 289-444.

finally the chapter on the Messiah and the Last Things of which we have spoken above. The author's Alexandrinism — to label his theory thus — is particularly evident when he is dealing with the idea of God and the intermediaries, a subject to which we shall return presently. Elsewhere he gives in general a satisfactory account of Palestinian teaching, so far as his sources and his somewhat indiscriminate use of them permit.

Eminently good is the exposition of the ways by which the favor of God is gained, a chapter which comprehends in brief the whole of practical religion. The author is dealing here with matters on which Jewish teaching is abundant, clear, consistent, and always the same; but no one before him had undertaken to bring it together and set it forth for Christian readers; indeed the subject had been almost completely ignored by his predecessors — a striking example of the insufficiency for historical purposes not only of the polemic and dogmatic methods, but of the vast accumulation of material made in a polemic or dogmatic interest. For the question, What must men do to be well-pleasing to God? goes to the heart of the matter. The answer to it tells us more than anything else what a religion really is. Gfroerer not only recognized the significance of this question, but lets the Jews themselves answer it in their own way and mainly in their own words. The chapter has not merely the merit of a first exploration in a neglected field; it is to this day the most adequate presentation of the subject from the hand of a Christian scholar, and its excellence is the more conspicuous by comparison with the treatment of the matter by more recent writers, particularly Ferdinand Weber and those who get their notions of Judaism from him.

Gfroerer distinguishes among the Palestinian Jews two widely different ideas of God. The great majority, as in all religions and in all times, conceived of God after the analogy of human personality, only immeasurably greater and better, creator, sustainer, and moral governor of the world, as he is represented in the Scriptures. A smaller number embraced the Alexandrian speculations which allowed the name God in its proper sense only to the pure Being of its ontology (*ὁ ὢν, τὸ ὄν*), an Absolute, of which, as it is in itself, nothing can be known, no

name given to it, no predicates applied, no attributes ascribed. Between this transcendent God and the world they posited an intermediary corresponding in nature and function to the Logos in Philo. The chief evidence that Gfroerer adduces to prove that a transcendent idea of God was entertained by influential Palestinian teachers is, in fact, the existence in the Targums³⁵ and Midrash of such figures as the Shekinah, Memra, Metatron, which he conceives to be explicable only as the intermediaries made necessary by a metaphysical idea of God that excludes him by definition from immediate transactions in nature or revelation. In this interpretation he was in accord with the long-standing traditions of Christian apologetics and dogmatics, proceeding from the same metaphysical idea of God.

Gfroerer is thus a precursor of the modern school which attributes to Palestinian Judaism as a fundamental dogma an idea of God which isolates him from the world in his infinite being and unapproachable holiness — the term transcendent is often used to define it. But he does not, like them, regard this as the general and dominant rabbinical conception; he confines it to the theosophic mystical circles who derived their theology from Alexandria and in which the Cabala was cultivated. And, so far from regarding it as something distinctively bad in Judaism by contrast with Christianity, he finds the same ideas in the Gospel of John, which he exalts above the others in a volume bearing the significant title, *Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit*.³⁶ His theory of the origin and nature of the Shekinah and Memra is erroneous, and the inference from it invalid; but his discrimination saves him from the gross misrepresentation of the prevailing Jewish conception of God into which his successors fall. Gfroerer is now seldom quoted, in part perhaps because he did not provide his volumes with indexes to make it easy to quote without reading. Nor is the

³⁵ The Targums on the Pentateuch and the Historical Books, which (with the exception of the so-called Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch) he makes older than the destruction of Jerusalem, are among his chief witnesses to the early prevalence of Alexandrian mystical theology in Palestine.

³⁶ Recall also the subtitle of his Philo (above, p. 223), 'vom Einflusse der jüdisch-ägyptischen Schule auf die Lehre des Neuen Testaments.'

book, with its wilderness of quotations in Latin and German easy reading, but one who is willing to undergo the labor may still learn much from it.

The book that has for forty years been the chief resource of Christian writers who have dealt *ex professo* or incidentally with Judaism at the beginning of the Christian era is Ferdinand Weber's *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie* (1880).³⁷ For a just estimate of this work it is necessary to premise somewhat about its origin. The author grew up in a pietistic atmosphere; he studied at Erlangen, then one of the strongholds of the new-fashioned Lutheranism, under Johann Christian Hofmann and Franz Delitzsch, and is redolent of the 'heilsgeschichtliche Theologie.' There he imbibed the anti-critical and unhistorical spirit of the school. His first publication was outlines of Introduction of the Old and New Testament, for teachers in higher schools and educated readers of the Bible (1863), of one of the later editions of which Heinrich Holtzmann said that the only thing it showed was how a man could write on these subjects without taking any note of what was going on about him. No less significant of his whole attitude was a series of articles in the *Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, entitled, *System des jüdischen Pharisäismus und des römischen Catholicismus* (1890).

Probably under Delitzsch's influence Weber conceived the idea of becoming a missionary to the Jews, and with this end in view began rabbinical studies under J. H. Biesenthal, a very competent scholar, himself a convert from Judaism and a missionary to the Jews, who like so many before him brought as a baptismal offering proofs of the Trinity and other Christian doctrines from the Cabala. Weber never succeeded in getting into the missionary calling, but the 'System' on which he spent the last years of his life was the outcome of studies undertaken to that end.

³⁷ Edited and published after the author's death by Franz Delitzsch and Georg Schnedermann; reissued with an extra title-page, 'Die Lehren des Talmuds' (1886), and in a second, 'improved' edition by Schnedermann under a third title, 'Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandte Schriften,' 1897. The improvements consist in an (incomplete) verification of the references by J. J. Kahan and occasional slight revision by the editor, not always for the better. (See, for example, the absurd Metatron-Crown Prince, 2d ed., p. 178.)

Now Jewish law, ritual, and observance, were ordered and codified in the Mishna and kindred works; but the Jews did nothing of the kind for the religious and moral teaching of the school and synagogue. No one even thought of extracting a theology from the utterances of the Rabbis in Midrash and Haggada, to say nothing of organizing the theology in a system; nor was the need of any connected presentation of Jewish doctrine felt until the controversies of the tenth century prompted Saadia to write the *Emunoth we-Deoth* after the example of Moslem Mutakallimin and upon the same philosophical principles. The fundamental criticism to be made of Weber's 'System' is precisely that it *is* a system of theology, and not an ancient Jewish system but a modern German system. This is far more than a mere matter of disposition, the ordering of the materials under certain heads taken from Christian dogmatics; the system brings its logic with it and imposes it upon the materials.

After the pattern of the 'material principle' and 'formal principle' of Lutheran dogmatics, Weber begins with *Das Materialprincip des Nomismus* and *Das Formalprincip des Nomismus*, each in several chapters. The 'material principle' is concisely formulated in the title of chapter 3: *Gesetzlichkeit des Wesen der Religion* — legalism is the sum and substance of religion, and is, in Jewish apprehension, the only form of religion for all ages. This 'nomism' is reflected in the idea of God (chap. 11): Where legalism is the essence of religion, religion is the right behavior of man before God, whereas 'we say,'³³ Religion is communion with God. God will admit man to his communion because he is not only holiness but love. In Judaism, on the contrary, where his holiness is exclusively emphasized, God remains absolutely exalted above the world and man, separated from them, abiding unchangeable in himself.

After a few sentences on the names of God, the remoteness of God in his supramundane exaltation becomes metaphysical:

³³ In the second edition Schnedermann transforms this opposition in the points of view ('wir sagen') into an antithesis in the proposition itself. The Jewish idea is that, 'Religion das rechte Verhalten des Menschen vor Gott ist, *nicht aber* Gemeinschaft des Menschen mit Gott.'

"From this fundamental conception of God as the Absolute, Jewish theology deduces two further (in reality antithetic) elements, which must be regarded as characteristic of the Jewish idea of God; namely, abstract monotheism and abstract transcendentalism. The former was developed and fixed in opposition to the trinitarian unfolding (*Erschliessung*) of the one Godhead in three persons, the latter in opposition to the personal indwelling of God in the human race."³⁹ Subsequent writers who use Weber as evidence of the Jewish idea of God in New Testament times in order to contrast with it Jesus' conception have overlooked this most significant passage. It is necessary, therefore to emphasize his express assertion that the antithetic conceptions of 'abstract monotheism' (or 'monism'!) and the 'abstract transcendentalism' in Jewish theology were 'developed and fixed' in opposition to the Trinitarianism and Christology of the church, and are therefore posterior to the development of those Christian doctrines.

It is equally important to remark that the 'fundamental conception' of an inaccessible God, whom, without perceiving the difference, he converts in the next breath into an Absolute God,⁴⁰ is derived from the principle that legalism is the essence of religion, from which, according to Weber, it follows by logical necessity. About this he deceives himself; the necessity is purely apologetic. The motive and method of the volume are in fact apologetic throughout; the author, like so many of his predecessors, sets himself to prove the superiority of Christianity to Judaism. In view of what is known of his life, it may perhaps without injustice be described more specifically as missionary apologetic: he would convince Jews how much better Christianity is than Judaism. This aim would explain the comparative absence of the polemic element which mingles so strongly with the ordinary apology.

A peculiar character is given to Weber's work also by his own religious and theological prepossessions. It is not catholic doctrine which is the explicit or implicit antithesis of Judaism,

³⁹ *System*, u. s. w., p. 145.

⁴⁰ As with equal obtuseness to the meaning of words he makes 'monism' equivalent to 'abstract monotheism.'

but Lutheranism of a peculiar modernized type of which Hofmann was the chief representative. The arbitrary contradiction created between the two conceptions of the essence of religion, conformity to the will of God and communion with God, with its consequences for the idea of God, and the singular theory of the Trinity to which we have already adverted are of this origin. A conspicuous example is to be found also in the treatment of 'Die Gerechtigkeit vor Gott und das Verdienst' (chap. 19), in which antipathy to the Roman Catholic doctrine of good works and merit transfers itself to Judaism.

In an introduction of thirty-four pages the rabbinical sources are described after Zunz and other Jewish authors, and in general with Zunz's dates, and the editions from which the author ordinarily quotes are specified — an unusual thoughtfulness for which those who verify their quotations would be more grateful if he had applied it to his references to the *Rabbith*. The *Cabala* and the *Pseudepigrapha* are excluded; Hellenistic Judaism is outside the author's plan. The omission of the liturgy of the synagogue and forms of private prayer in the survey of the sources is, however, an error of grave consequence. Incidentally it shows with how little independence Weber planned and performed his task — his predecessors had not concerned themselves with this material. The principles on which the sources are to be employed are briefly stated; they are sounder than his application of them in practice. Finally, there is a survey of the older literature down to Wagenseil and Bodenschatz, on which somewhat sweeping unfavorable judgment is passed. No mention is any where made of Gfroerer, and the omission is hardly accidental; a pupil of Baur and a convert to Catholicism was anathema in Weber's circle on both counts.

No intimation is given of the nature and extent of Weber's indebtedness to the predecessors who in the course of centuries had collected for one purpose or another a vast mass of quotations and references. Perhaps if he had lived to publish the volume himself, he might have acknowledged his obligations in a preface, though the Introduction would have been the

natural place for them. As it is one might get the impression that Weber meant to give the appearance of having gone at the Targum, Talmuds, and Midrashim as though nobody had been there before him, and collected all his materials for himself; and in fact Christian scholars unfamiliar with the older literature have generally taken him at this estimate and attributed to him a measure of learning much beyond the reality.⁴¹ There is no question that he had read industriously and had the assistance of converted Jews; but that he built on other men's foundations and largely with their materials is easily demonstrable. Most of his quotations come out of the common stock which had been accumulated by the labors of many generations, not all of them even verified. Confiding successors have appropriated these errors, and not always given Weber the credit of them.

The passages which Weber adduces from the sources (in German translation) are copious and in general relevant to his proposition. It must be emphasized, however, that in detaching them from their original associations and using them as *dicta probantia* for the *loci* of a systematic theology whose 'system' is the antithesis of Judaism to Christianity, they are methodically misused. To much of this material—to the exegetical ingenuities and homiletical conceits of the Midrash and the playful imaginations of the Haggada, for example—the Jews attached no theological character or authority. Weber on 'Die Judaisirung des Gottesbegriffes' (pp. 153–157) is a salient instance of such misuse of the sources. Incidentally also of his use of his predecessors. If any one will take the trouble to compare this section with Eisenmenger's chapter, 'Was vor ungeziemende und theils lästerliche Dinge die verstockten Juden von Gott dem Vater lehren und schreiben'

⁴¹ It does not inspire confidence in the author's rabbinical erudition to read (p. xx) that according to Sanhedrin 86a the anonymous utterances in Sifra are to be taken as sayings of R. Judah the Holy, 'from which it follows that the Talmud regards R. Judah the Holy as the author of Sifra.' The Talmud says R. Judah, by which name not 'Judah the Holy,' but Judah ben Ilai (in the preceding generation) is regularly designated. In the second edition 'the Holy' disappears; but with the consequence that in the sequel Rab is said to have been a disciple in the school of Judah, which would seem to give Rab an extraordinarily long life.

(i, 1 ff., esp. pp. 1-54), will find Weber's references sometimes for a page together in the same order. It is curious that he should have made such use of a work of which, with others of the kind, he says that they are "weit mehr Sammlungen aller möglichen Absurditäten und Frivolitäten, als religionsgeschichtliche Darstellungen," and of a chapter in which Eisenmenger outdoes himself in that vein. Eisenmenger, however, got together this material (and much more) only to hold up the Jews to derision and contempt; Weber seriously derives from it a 'Judaized' idea of God, and has a serious theory to explain how an idea so incongruous with their 'transcendentism' ever came to be entertained—it was the growing dominance of 'the principle of democracy' which transformed God into 'a God of the Torah.'

Weber's original contribution to the misunderstanding of Judaism was what he calls 'transcendentism,' the inaccessibility of God, wherein he finds the characteristic difference of the Jewish idea of God, and its immense inferiority to the Christian idea. That this was the Jewish idea, is proved for him, as has been already noted, by the intermediaries which, according to him, Judaism interposed between God and the world: if God himself were not transcendent, there would be no use for them. The older apologetic, better instructed in Christian theology, had consistently labored to prove that these intermediaries corresponded exactly to their own Logos, the Son, Christ, discovering in them no difference between the Jewish idea of God and the Christian — the identity is, indeed, always assumed. The Christology of the church and its Trinitarian dogma are in fact based upon a metaphysical doctrine of the Absolute; and from their first acquaintance with it Christian scholars recognized their own philosophy of religion in the transcendental Neoplatonism of the speculative Cabala, which they regarded as the ancient esoteric doctrine of Judaism. Weber's antithesis between the transcendent God of Jewish theology and the contrary in Christian theology ⁴² shows how little he knew about either the history or the content of Christian dogma. What

⁴² The contrary of a transcendent God, is not, as historically and logically it should be, an *immanent* God, but what may be called a sociable God.

has led recent scholars of other schools and of greatly superior theological learning to adopt Weber's interpretation and judgment of Judaism and to put the Jewish idea of God in a new antithesis to Christianity is a question to which we shall revert later.

Besides the causes of misunderstanding that have been remarked above, particular misinterpretations are not infrequent, and are sometimes of far-reaching consequence. A striking instance of this kind may be found on page 174 f., where Weber discovers in the *dibbūr* of *Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah* fol. 3 a (Sulzbach; ed. Wilna, 1884, fol. 4 b) 'the basis for the understanding of the Memra of Jehovah in the Targums,' "des aus dem Munde Gottes hervorgegangenen Wortes, welches als göttliche Potenz innerhalb der Heilsgeschichte wirkend sich in der Anschauung des Judentums zur Person verdichtet hat und als mittlere Hypostase zwischen Gott und seinem Volke steht." As Weber paraphrases: "At the proclamation of the Ten Commandments, the *dibbūr* proceeded out of the mouth of God, and then went to each Israelite in the camp and asked him whether he would accept it, setting before him at the same time all the obligations as well as the reward involved in the acceptance. As soon as an Israelite had answered in the affirmative and accepted the Word, the Dibur kissed him on the mouth."

The passage on which such large dogmatic conclusions are based is a peculiarly far-fetched homiletic conceit on Cant. 1, 2, 'Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth.' R. Johanan said that at the lawgiving at Sinai, "An angel brought out the word (*dibbūr*) from the presence of God, each word separately,⁴³ and took it around to every individual Israelite, saying to him, Do you take upon you this word?" He explained all that was implied in the commandment as well as what was explicitly required, the penalties of transgression, and the reward of obedience. "If the Israelite said, Yes, the angel further asked, Do you take upon you the Godhead of the

⁴³ *Dibbūr* is 'speech, utterance'; specifically one of the Ten Utterances (*debarim*, rabbinical, *debaroth*), which the Greek version (Exod. 34, 28) and Philo call *δέκα λόγοι*, and we after them the Decalogue.

Holy One? If he answered, Yes, Yes, the angel kissed him on the mouth — this is what is said (in Deut. 4, 35): ‘Thou wast made to see, to know’ (by the hand of a messenger).”⁴⁴ The majority, however, gave a slightly different turn to the conceit — and here we come to Weber’s quotation: The several commandments were not carried about one by one by an angel, but each *dibbūr* (‘commandment’) itself went about on the same errand, made the same explanations, and, being accepted, kissed the man on his mouth, etc.

The difference between R. Johanan and the majority is not over the impersonality or personality of the word: a more plausible suggestion is offered by a commentator steeped in the mind of the Midrash, that it has its origin in a different interpretation of ‘the great host’ in Psalm 68, 12, one taking it of the angels, the others of the Israelites. But whatever remoter conceits may have been in the homilists imaginations, Weber’s partial quotation needs only to be completed from its context to prove his interpretation and application false. And, even if not misinterpreted and misapplied, what kind of a basis for the ‘hypostatic Word of God’ are such curiosities of ingenuity as are displayed in asking and answering the question who is the kisser and who the kissed in Cant. 1, 2, and when, and where, and what for? I have dwelt on this case at some length, as a warning against that implicit confidence in Weber which prevails among those who are not able to bring him to book. Before I leave the subject I am going to give one illustration of how Weber at second-hand is worse than himself. Oesterley and Box, with the remark that it ‘illustrates the underlying conception of the *Memra*,’ reproduce as follows the passage from Weber quoted above: “The passage is dealing with the account of the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai, and it is explained that the ‘Word’ (*Memra*) came forth from the mouth of God when the Ten Commandments were pronounced, and went forth to each Israelite, asking each if he would accept these commandments,” etc. “As soon as an Israelite signified

⁴⁴ The quotation of these catch-words must be understood to call to mind the sequel, ‘that the Lord, he is God; there is none beside him. Out of heaven he made thee to hear his voice that he might instruct thee,’ etc.

his willingness to become obedient to the Law, the 'Word' kissed him on his lips."⁴⁵

Numerous equally striking examples of Weber at second hand may be found by those who are in search of such entertainment in the article 'Shekinah' in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, by J. T. Marshall. I can make room here for only one of them. In a paragraph on the activity of the Shekinah not only on earth but in Sheol (p. 489 A) we read: "But in Bereshith Rabba to Gn. 44, 8 the Shekinah is the deliverer. It affirms that the wicked Jews now 'bound in Gehinnom' will ascend out of hell, *with the Shekinah at their head.*" For this, reference is made with a certain superfluity to both editions of Weber. In abridging Weber, Marshall has eliminated the association with Micah 2, 13 ('and their King shall pass over before them and the Lord at their head') which alone makes the Midrash intelligible. This by the way. The point of the story is in the reference to 'Bereshith Rabba to Gn. 44, 8.' A reader whose skepticism was properly aroused by this altogether unusual method of citing the Midrash, and who undertook to find the place, would find nothing but a justification of his skepticism. The quotation, in fact, is not from the Midrash Bereshith Rabbah at all. It is derived from the Pugio Fidei (p. 685), where it is attributed to the Bereshith Rabba of Rabbi Moses ha-Darshan, that is to say to a lost work by a French Rabbi at the close of the eleventh century. But the end is not yet. In Carpzov's edition of the Pugio which Weber used the reference 'Gen. 44. v. 8' is a misprint, as the first words of the quotation ויגש אליו יהודה — the *incipit* of the Parasha ויגש, Gen. 44, 18 — would betray at a glance to any reader who paid attention to what he was about. The case incidentally demonstrates that neither Weber nor Marshall had ever tried to verify the reference. In the second edition of Weber, Kahan has put a (?) after the reference, showing that he had looked for it but not been able to find it in Bereshith Rabbah, which might at least have served as a danger signal to Marshall.

⁴⁵ Religion and Worship of the Synagogue, p. 182 f.

Finally, it is to be observed that in treating of the intermediaries (Shekinah, Memra, Metatron), although Weber abjures the testimony of the Cabala, he takes over the conceptions and associations which his predecessors had derived from the Cabala, and interprets in accordance with them the testimony of the Targums and Midrash — a fallacy of method in which he has many fellows. A bad example of such contamination occurs in the section on the Metatron (p. 174), where, having by way of the mediaeval Gematria, $\text{מטטרון} = 314 = \text{שרי}$, discovered that Metatron is a 'representative of the Almighty,' he continues: "In this sense he bears in Hullin 69 a and Yebamoth 16 b the name שר העולם , Prince of the World; he represents God's sovereignty (*Herrscherstellung*) in the world." The Talmud neither in the places cited nor anywhere else calls Metatron *sar ha-'ōlam*. To judge from a comparison of the contexts, Weber had his references from Levy (*Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, II, 31), where, however, the identification is not attributed to the Talmud, but (incorrectly) to the Tosaphoth, or supplementary glosses (supplementary, that is, to Rashi), chiefly from the French schools of the thirteenth century. In the Tosaphoth themselves the identity is discussed, a propos of the apparently conflicting use of the title in certain mediaeval hymns, but is *not* affirmed. Eisenmenger (II, 397), and so far as I know every one who touched the subject before Weber, stated the matter correctly.

Six years before Weber, appeared another work which was destined more than any other in its time to influence Christian notions of Judaism, namely, Emil Schürer, *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (1874). The name, which came into vogue in the sixth and seventh decades of the last century, did not mean a history of New Testament times, but designated a part of what in earlier days would have been comprehended under Introduction to the New Testament. Its practical purpose was to put the student in the way of acquiring a variety of knowledges which are necessary to the understanding of the New Testament and the beginnings of Christianity. Schneckenburger (1862) had included the Gentile world of the time, but Schürer limits the scope of his *Lehrbuch*

to the Jewish side. After an introduction on the sources he devotes half the volume to the political history of Palestine from 175 B.C. to 70 A.D. The second part has the subtitle, 'Das innere Leben des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Christi,' and deals with the country and its populations, Jewish institutions, the sects, the scribes and their learning, schools and synagogues, life under the Law; then (on a much larger scale), the apocalyptic literature, and the Messianic expectation. The volume concludes with chapters on Judaism in the dispersion, and on Philo.

Subsequent editions, greatly enlarged, appeared under the title, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, but without any considerable change in the character or plan of the work. Schürer's volumes are an indispensable repertory for all sorts of things about the Jews — history, archaeology, geography, chronology, institutions, cultus, sects and parties, literature, etc. — treated as distinct subjects of investigation and presentation. The work has an external unity in serviceability for a practical purpose, but lacks the historical bond which alone could give it an inner unity. This observation is not an adverse criticism on the work; Schürer did what he set out to do, and made an immeasurably useful handbook. But the reader must take it and use it for what it is, not for what its author, notwithstanding the title, never intended it to be — history. Least of all did he propose to write a history of the Jewish religion in the period he covers, or a description of it as it was at the beginning of our era. He treats at large the Messianic expectation — under which he included the whole eschatology — twice, first in its development and then again systematically. The only other subject in the sphere of religion which is given a place of its own is 'Life under the Law.' The selection of these two subjects and no others is explained by their signal importance for the understanding of the beginnings of Christianity — the different forms of Messianic expectation among the Jews in relation to correspondingly varied forms of belief among Christians about Jesus the Messiah, and Life under the Law as explaining and justifying Jesus' criticism of the Scribes and Pharisees.

The consequence of the isolation of these subjects from their place in Jewish religion as a whole is to give the erroneous impression that the Law and the Messianic expectation are not only, as Schürer puts it, the two poles of Judaism, but that they are the sum and substance of it. This impression is greatly strengthened by the contents of the section on Life under the Law. To Schürer, notwithstanding his very different theological standpoint, as much as to Weber, Judaism was synonymous with 'legalism,' and 'legalism' was his most cherished religious antipathy. The motive of the legalized religiousness of the Jews was retribution, reward and punishment here and hereafter, in the exact measure of the merit or demerit of particular acts of transgression or omission — retribution for the individual and the people. As this motive is essentially external, the result was an incredible externalizing of the religious and moral life, the whole of which is drawn down into the 'juristic' sphere. The evil consequences that necessarily follow are developed at large; the upshot of it is that life becomes a service of the letter for the letter's sake. The outward correctness of the action is the thing, not the inward end and motive. "And all this trivial and perverted zeal professes to be the true and right religion. The more pains men took, the more they believed that they gained the favor of God."⁴⁶

Schürer goes on to illustrate the errors into which this 'zeal for God not according to knowledge' (Rom. 10, 2) led, and the heavy burdens it laid on the Israelite, by describing in detail, chiefly after the Mishna, the regulations for Sabbath observance, the rules of clean and unclean, the prescriptions about the wearing of fringes, phylacteries, prayer-shawls; the formalizing of prayer, fasting, and the like. Even the occasional fine sayings of individual Rabbis are for him only streaks of light which make blacker the shadows they can not illumine. In conclusion, Schürer pronounces judgment on the Jewish religion in terms of solemn condemnation. It is significant that, while almost everything else in the work was revised and rewritten in the successive editions, this chapter remains nearly

⁴⁶ Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, § 27; especially pp. 483 f., 510 f.; Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes, u. s. w., § 28; 3d edit. ii, 464 ff., 469, 495, etc.

verbatim to the last; even the original vehemence of expression is unsoftened by years.

It is to be taken into account in estimating his depreciatory judgment that Schürer was never widely read in the literature of the school and the synagogue, and that he paid the least attention to precisely those parts of it from which most may be learned about religious feeling and the inwardness of Jewish piety. It may be added that Schürer himself was temperamentally lacking in the sympathetic imagination which recreates other times, other men, other manners, alien ways of thinking and feeling, philosophies and religions remote from our own, in the endeavor to realize what they meant in their own time and place. But after all allowance is made the final word must be that 'Life under the Law' was conceived, not as a chapter of the history of Judaism but as a topic of Christian apologetic; it was written to prove by the highest Jewish authority that the strictures on Judaism in the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles are fully justified. It is greatly to be regretted that Schürer's eminent merits in everything external should have led New Testament scholars generally to attach equal authority to his representation and judgment of the Jewish religion.

In another respect Schürer's work marks a change in the point of view. His predecessors, generally speaking, compare and contrast Judaism and Christianity as wholes, and from the point of view of their own time; Weber compares the Palestinian Judaism of the first five centuries of our era with his own variety of nineteenth century Protestantism, unhistorically imagined to be Christianity itself. Schürer's purpose to furnish the necessary knowledge for the understanding of the beginnings of Christianity confines the comparison to narrower limits. The Messianic expectations of the contemporary Jews are reflected in Christian conceptions; the opposition to legalism is a primitive factor in the gospel. The problem of the origin of Christianity historically conceived demands, however, an investigation of every other phase of Judaism at the beginning of our era, and the endeavor to define what Christianity took over from Judaism as well as what was new in it. For such

a purpose a critical history of Judaism in that age, say from the beginning of the second century B.C. to the end of the second century A.D., both Palestinian and Hellenistic, became indispensable.

This is what the title of Bousset's *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (1903; 2d ed. 1906) promises. The author is conscious that in undertaking a comprehensive presentation of what he strangely calls 'die Religion des Spätjudentums' he is assuming a task which no one since Gfroerer had set his hand to, and, while pointing out the limitations of Gfroerer's work, he has a juster appreciation of its merits than those of his predecessors who have anything to say about it: "Der ganze Wurf ist gross und kühn gedacht. Man wird von ihm immer aufs neue lernen müssen."

Bousset was, like Schürer, a New Testament scholar, and his interest in Judaism also was not for its own sake, but for the light it might throw on the beginnings of Christianity. One of his first published writings was, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich* (1892). In it the author seeks to prove that the character and teaching of Jesus can be explained, not as having their roots in Judaism, but only as the antithesis to Judaism in every essential point. The book is closely associated with Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit* (1888), and Johann Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes* (1890),⁴⁷ and like them endeavors to solve its problems by bringing the teaching of Jesus into connection with the religion in which he had been brought up. The idea was not as new as some of the advertisements of the 'religionsgeschichtliche Methode' might lead one to think — no philologist would ever have admitted that there was any other method — but it was at least potentially more fruitful than a prosecution *in infinitum* of the internal criticism and exegesis of the

⁴⁷ It is not without significance that all these authors — Schürer, Baldensperger, Weiss, Bousset — were New Testament scholars, the oldest of them scarcely past thirty years old. Schürer was the only one who thought it necessary to know anything about the rabbinical sources, and he found in Surenhusius' Mishna just the right material for the demonstration of 'legalism.' Beyond this he never went; the others did not go so far.

Gospels. Whether it should bear good fruit or evil depended, however, on the knowledge of Judaism the investigators brought to bear on their subject. In Bousset's case, as with Baldensperger and Weiss, this knowledge was a negligible quantity. It could not have been otherwise: a Privatdozent of twenty-seven, only getting fairly started with his courses on the New Testament, would be a prodigy if he had, of his own, anything properly to be called knowledge in so diverse and difficult a field. What Bousset lacked in knowledge, he made up, however, in the positiveness and confidence of his opinions, and for the failure to present evidence, by an effective use of what psychologists call suggestion — unsupported assertion coming by force of sheer reiteration to appear to the reader self-evident or something he had always known.

The fundamental contrast between Jesus and Judaism, as Bousset asserts it, is in the idea of God and the feeling toward him. The God of Judaism in that age was withdrawn from the world, supramundane, extramundane, transcendent. "The prophetic preaching of the exaltation and uniqueness of Jehovah became the dogma of an abstract, transcendent monotheism." So it is reiterated page after page. "God is no more in the world, the world no more in God." For the evidence, the reader is habitually referred to Baldensperger, and by Baldensperger chiefly to the apocalyptic literature. In contrast to this, "What is most completely original and truly creative in the preaching of Jesus comes out most strongly and purely when he proclaims God the heavenly Father." "The later Judaism (i.e. that of Jesus' time) had neither in name nor in fact the faith of the Father-God; it could not possibly rise to it." And as the whole 'Gesetzesfrömmigkeit' of Judaism is based upon its increasingly transcendent conception of God, so the new conception introduced by Jesus is the ground of a wholly new type of piety.

The symptomatic thing in this book is the implication that the specific difference between Christianity and Judaism is to be sought in the teaching of Jesus. Christian theology had always found it in the doctrine of the person and work of Christ, and, so far as the teaching of Jesus was concerned, in what he

said about his personal relation to God and his mission in the world, not in what he thought and taught about God nor in the form of his personal piety and its supposed perpetuation in Christianity. The historian can only characterize the notion that the fatherhood of God is the cardinal doctrine of Christianity and its cardinal difference from Judaism as a misrepresentation of historical Christianity no less than of Judaism. I have given more space to this little volume than its intrinsic importance would warrant because it exhibits the presumptions which underlie Bousset's later and larger work in which he sets himself to portray the Judaism of that age as a whole.

The censure which Jewish scholars have unanimously passed on *Die Religion des Judentums* is that the author uses as his primary sources almost exclusively the writings commonly called Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, with an especial penchant for the apocalypses; and only secondarily, and almost casually, the writings which represent the acknowledged and authoritative teachings of the school and the more popular instruction of the synagogue. This is much as if one should describe early Christianity using indiscriminately for his principal sources the Apocryphal Gospels and Acts, the Apocalypses of John and Peter, and the Clementine literature.⁴⁸ Bousset defends his procedure on two grounds; *First*, he thus methodically confines himself to the evidence of writings which were approximately contemporaneous with the New Testament, whereas the oldest of the books in which the rabbinical teaching is preserved date from the close of the second century of our era, being separated from the time of Christ not only by several generations but by two great crises in Judaism, the destruction of Jerusalem and the war under Hadrian, while the bulk of the literature consists of compilations made some centuries later. The only criterion by which it can be determined what of all their voluminous contents was really taught

⁴⁸ This parallel must often have occurred to critics. Perles (*Boussets Religion des Judentums*, p. 23) quotes Chwolson, *Das letzte Passamahl Christi* (1892), p. 71: So wenig man das Wesen des Christenthums aus der Apokalypse Johannis oder aus apokryphischen Evangelien kennen lernen kann, ebensowenig kann man das Judenthum zur Zeit Christi aus dem Buche Enoch, dem Buche der Jubiläen und ähnlichen Schriften erforschen.

in the time of Christ is the New Testament itself and the Jewish apocryphal writings to which he gives the preference. *Second*, his aim is not to present what the scribes taught in the schools (*Schriftgelehrtentum*) but the religious conceptions and sentiments of the people (*Volksfrömmigkeit*), and this he assumes to be expressed in the popular literature, particularly in the apocalypses.

This is not the place to discuss the propriety of these limitations from the point of view of historical method, or the validity of the contrast drawn between the teaching of the Rabbis and the piety of the people; but it is clear that the author ought not to have called his book *Die Religion des Judentums*, for the sources from which his representation is drawn are those to which, so far as we know, Judaism never conceded any authority, while he discredits and largely ignores those which it has always regarded as normative. That the critical use of the latter is difficult is indisputable, though Bousset exaggerates the difficulty into an impossibility; but the critical problems which the former present, while of a different kind, are no less difficult, though Bousset blinks the most serious of them. How wide, for example, was the currency of these writings? Do they represent a certain common type of 'Volksfrömmigkeit,' or did they circulate in circles with peculiar notions and tendencies of their own? How far do they come from sects regarded by the mass of their countrymen as heretical? So far as concerns the influence of the ideas found in such sources on the Messianic conceptions and beliefs of the disciples of Jesus or of Jesus himself, these questions are of comparatively little consequence; the connection itself is the thing to be established. They become of the highest consequence, however, when it comes to using this literature as a principal source for the history of Judaism, and especially to giving it precedence over the teaching of the school and synagogue represented in the rabbinical sources.

The relative age of the writings is of much less importance than their relation to the main line of development which can be followed from the canonical Scriptures through many of the postcanonic writings, including the Synoptic Gospels and the

liturgy of the synagogue, to the Midrash and Halakah of the second century. No account of Judaism would be complete which ignored the apocalypses and the kindred literature, but such incompleteness would not fundamentally misrepresent its subject as does an account based chiefly on them. The criterion is exactly the same which the historian applies to the history of Christianity, say in the first two centuries. Anonymous writings like the recently discovered *Epistola Apostolorum*, which fall into the line of development that we reconstruct or postulate between the New Testament and Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, belong to the history of catholic Christianity, and may be important additions to our sources for it. Writings that lie, on the whole, to one side or the other of this line, may contain much that by this criterion is the common Christianity of the age, and so far these also may be used, with proper caution, as adjunct sources. On the other hand, what in them, individually or as classes, is not thus verified by the common tradition, whatever currency it may have had at the time in certain circles or sects, is a source only for variations of Christianity which it eventually repudiated. To ignore, or deliberately reject, this self-evident principle of historical criticism in dealing with Judaism is to disqualify oneself at the outset.

In truth, Bousset never conceived his task as a historian; it was not Judaism as a religion, but Judaism as the background, environment, source, and foil of nascent Christianity that he had in mind, with a strong secondary interest in the 'das religionsgeschichtliche Problem,' the relation of Judaism to the Babylonian religion, and especially to Zoroastrianism. Since for both purposes he found the most convenient material in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, particularly the apocalyptic literature, he made them his chief authorities. There was another reason for his neglect of the rabbinical sources: he had only second-hand acquaintance with them, and that of the most superficial character. It is only necessary to read the half-dozen pages he devotes to 'Die spätere Litteratur' in his chapter, 'Die Quellen,' to recognize that even what he knew *about* them was negligently and unintelligently compiled from

bibliographical descriptions. The single foot-note (2) on page 43 (repeated in the second edition, p. 47 f., with the correction of a minor error which had been signalized by Perles), is a testimonial of incompetence in this field, the more significant because he had Schürer in his hands. It is not surprising that Jewish scholars criticized the work harshly. They found it easy to convict the author of portentous blunders in his incidental adventures into Hebrew; as when (following Schlatter — the blind leading the blind into the ditch — see Perles, 'Boussets Religion des Judentums,' p. 15) he renders נאמן ('trustworthy,' in matters of tithes and the like, M. Demai, ii, 2) by 'gläubig,' ('believing'), and introduces it into a discussion of Faith; nor is it strange that Perles and others made themselves disagreeable over Bousset's rabbinical erudition.⁴⁹ The temper of Bousset's *oratio pro domo sua* is not more urbane, and, as often happens with apologias, he only made a bad case worse by arguing it.

Bousset, nevertheless, frequently cites the utterances of the Rabbis, especially when they coincide with his primary sources, supplementing the inevitable Weber from Bacher's *Agada der Tannaiten* and from Wünsche's translations, and, within a limited range, from Dalman's *Worte Jesu*. In not a few instances the interpretation he gives to them and the use he makes of them show how perilous the quotation of quotations is, and emphasize the observation that the ways of the Midrash are not to be understood by any one who has not habituated himself to them by voluminous reading of the original texts in their continuity and acquiring something of a midrashic mind. The whole point, meaning, and reason of its interpretations are often impossible to reproduce in translation, or to explain to the uninitiated in notes, which give the appearance of absurdity to what in the Midrashic exegesis is self-evident.

Of Bousset's general attitude toward Judaism and his judgment of it enough has already been said; it is only necessary

⁴⁹ He thinks, for example, that the language of the Talmuds is Aramaic. Even in Biblical Hebrew he was ill-grounded, as is convincingly shown by the remark: 'Die alttestamentliche Sprache hat noch kein Wort für Schöpfer, und muss den Mangel durch Partizipialkonstruktionen ersetzen' (p. 412).

to add that in the later and larger book, they remain essentially unchanged, still dominated by the antithesis to the teaching of Jesus. The second edition (1906) is in many ways an improvement on the first. The original plan, which put in the forefront 'Die Entwicklung der jüdischen Frömmigkeit zur Kirche,' evoked protest from Christians, to whom this seemed to make the development into a church a retrogression from the religion of the Old Testament; and though the author maintained the correctness of his point of view, he abandoned this highly artificial disposition because he found that he could not bring under this head all that he wanted to put in this part of the volume. There are other changes for the better in the arrangement of the book, and some important additions, notably a chapter on prayer, the absence of which in the first edition was eloquent. Corrections in detail are also numerous, though far from numerous enough. One instructive example may be noted. In his earlier work he asserted that the later Judaism had neither the name nor the faith of the Father-God; it could not rise to it. In the first edition of *Die Religion des Judentums*, he wrote: "Sehr charakteristisch ist es, wie selten . . . die Bezeichnung Gottes als des Vaters im Spätjudentum vorkommt." In the second edition this is replaced by, "Hervorzuheben ist . . . dass auch die Bezeichnung Gottes als des Vaters der Einzelnen Frommen im späteren Judentum entschieden häufiger ist."⁵⁰ But even then he makes all possible subtraction from the significance of the concession. The chapter on monotheism, with the following on angelology, demonology, and 'die Hypostasen-Spekulation,' repeat the familiar theses which need not again be recited.

One remark, however, may properly be made: Whoever derives the Jewish idea of God chiefly from apocalypses will get the picture of a God enthroned in the highest heaven, remote from the world, a mighty monarch surrounded by a celestial court, with ministers of various ranks, of whom only the highest have immediate access to the presence of the sovereign, unapproachable even by angels of less exalted station, to say

⁵⁰ Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum* (1892), p. 43; *Religion des Judentums* (1903), p. 355; 2d edition (1906), pp. 432 f.

nothing of mere mortals; and this not because theological reflection has elevated him to transcendence, but because the entire imaginative representation is conditioned by the visionary form. If the prophet has a vision of the throne-room of God's palace, as in Isaiah 6, or the seer is conducted by an angel through one heaven after another to the very threshold of the adytum, what other kind of representation is possible? To extract a dogma from such visions is to misunderstand the origin and nature of the whole apocalyptic literature. It is the same thing with the so-called 'pre-existent Messiah' in these writings: when once vision takes the place of prediction, the Messiah has to be there in order to be seen; it is not a doctrine, but a simple condition of visionary representation. The creation of the *name* of the Messiah before the world in rabbinic sources is something totally different.

If Bousset's book be taken for what it is, it is a serviceable hand-book. The accumulation of references to terms and phrases in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha upon the several topics is often almost exhaustive, but they have not always been made from the original texts. Aristeas § 37 appears (ed. 2, p. 257) among the places where ὑψιστος occurs, because the translator in Kautzsch's Pseudepigrapha happened to render τῷ μεγίστῳ θεῷ by 'dem Höchsten.' German idiom has played the author other tricks. On the preceding page, speaking of יי as a surrogate or circumlocution for God, he writes: 'Die Prädikate der höchste Gott, der Höchste, versetzen uns ja eigentlich auf den Boden polytheistischen Empfindens. Vom höchsten Gott kann streng genommen nur da die Rede sein, wo es mehrere Götter für den Glauben gibt.' It is quite true that the German superlative 'der Höchste,' may imply that there are others not so high; but it is also true that the superlative and its implications are not in the Hebrew.

A word may be said in conclusion about a recent popular book in English, Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue. An Introduction to the Study of Judaism from the New Testament Period* (1907). The part with which alone we are here concerned, 'Dogmatic Judaism,' is based entirely on modern authors — among whom Jewish scholars are more

frequently allowed the word than in most similar books — not at all on immediate knowledge of the sources. The latter are, indeed, abundantly cited in a way that makes it look as if they had been consulted, but it is evident in many cases that the authors did not even verify their references. The chapter on 'Intermediate Agencies between God and Man' is one long proof of this. One or two striking examples have been incidentally mentioned above.⁵¹ Here I will name but one or two at random: "In *Bemidbar rabbah*, c. 12, the term 'Mediator' is directly applied to *Metatron*, and, what is still more significant, he is represented as the reconciler between God and the Chosen People" (p. 175). To begin with, this part of *Bemidbar Rabbah* is mediaeval (perhaps 12th century), dependent on late Midrashim and cabalistic sources; its testimony would be worthless if it gave any. In the second place, there is no word in the text or context that remotely suggests 'Mediator,' to say nothing of being directly applied to *Metatron*; in the third place, what is said about *Metatron* is that he offers (on the heavenly altar) 'the souls of the righteous to atone for Israel in the days of their exile,' an office elsewhere performed by Michael. Again: "In a number of passages in the *Old Testament* the expression the 'Word,' in reference to Jehovah, is used in a way which, one can easily understand, appeared to Jewish thinkers of a later age to indicate that the 'Word' meant something more than a mere abstraction" (p. 179). Among other passages of this kind they quote Deut. 5, 5: "I stood between the Lord and you at that time to show you the word of the Lord." That is the Authorized English version; the Hebrew has "to report to you (להגיד לכם) the word of the Lord, because ye were afraid of the fire," etc. The authors apparently took the English 'show' in the sense of 'exhibit.' In this whole string of passages the English version is the beginning and end of knowledge. Thus, in Wisdom 9, 1: "O God of my fathers, and Lord of mercy, Who hast made all things with thy word," they understand *with* as 'in association with, with the assistance of.' The Greek is ἐν ('by') not σύν. One of the most amusing is the quotation of 2 (4) Esdras 6, 38 for

⁵¹ See above, pp. 235 f.

which they give: "Thy word was (i.e., *made*) a perfect work." This is the Authorized Version from the corrupt text in the appendix to the standard Latin Bible: In the beginning of the creation God said, 'Fiat caelum et terra, et tuum verbum opus perfectum.' The true reading, as has been established for a half-century, is *opus perfecit*, 'Thy word brought the work to pass.' Mr. Box himself has since reprinted the Latin text of 4 Esdras from Fritzsche (1871), where the correct reading might have been found in 1907 as easily as in 1912, not to mention Hilgenfeld (1869) or Bensly-James (1895). If this reading, instead of being that of the manuscripts, were unsupported by a single codex, it would infallibly be restored by conjecture. To create doctrine for the Jews at the beginning of our era out of a misunderstanding of the authorized English version of 1611, or from the translation in the same version of a nonsensical reading in a Latin Apocryphon, is, to say the least, not in accordance with the best practice among scholars.

It may not be unprofitable, here in conclusion, to review briefly the course of this long history. Beginning with an early Christian apologetic, in which the controversial points were the interpretation and application of passages in the Old Testament, the fulfilment of prophecies of the Messiah in the nativity of Jesus, his life and death, resurrection, and ascension, the identification of Christ with the manifest God, or Angel of the Lord, in the Old Testament, the discussion in the Middle Ages took a wider range and assumed a more learned character in the endeavor to demonstrate that Christian doctrines were supported by the authentic Jewish tradition — Targum, Talmud, Midrash — or by the most highly reputed Jewish interpreters. In the progress of the controversy polemic prevailed over apologetic on both sides, the champions of each seeking out for attack the most vulnerable points in the cause of their opponents. The direct outcome of this conflict was the war waged upon the Talmud itself and the effort to procure the destruction of obnoxious Jewish literature as a whole.

The Christian scholars who resisted this obscurantist programme in the sixteenth century argued on the other hand that

these books should be preserved because from them, above all from the Cabala, all the doctrines of Christianity — the Trinity, the Deity of Christ and the rest — could be proved to be the ancient esoteric theology of the Jews themselves.

The Reformation put upon Protestants the task of building up upon the Scriptures alone a complete system of doctrine, and they endeavored not only to show that the ancient Jewish doctrine was in essential accord with the common Christian dogma, but that on the issues in debate between Protestants and Catholics the Jews were on the Protestant side. Thus a strong dogmatic interest took its place beside the older apologetic and polemic. A broader interest in learning for its own sake as well as its uses prevailed largely in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and led, as has been sufficiently remarked, to the creation of a great body of learned literature in every branch of Hebrew antiquities.

The early Protestant exegesis of the Old Testament was almost wholly dependent on Jewish commentaries and apparatus, and the illustration of many passages in the Old Testament from later Jewish law and custom also began early. The same thing was done for the New Testament, particularly the Gospels, not only in commentaries but in a succession of notably learned works specifically devoted to this end, the *Horae Hebraicae* and whatever else they may be called; and, directly or through Wettstein, these illustrations from Talmud and Midrash became part of the perpetual tradition of New Testament commentaries.

In all this time no attempt had been made by Christian scholars to present Judaism in the age which concerned them most — say from the time of Alexander to that of the Antonines — as a whole and as it was in and for itself. Nor did those who came after them address themselves to this neglected task. When in the nineteenth century the study of Judaism was in some measure revived, the actuating motive was to find in it the milieu of early Christianity. Gfroerer conceived this problem historically, and, as we have seen, actually included his description of the Judaism of that period in his *Critical History of Primitive Christianity*. Weber set himself to ex-

hibit the system of Palestinian Jewish theology in the first three or four centuries of our era as the antithesis of Christian theology and religion as they were taught in certain contemporary German schools. Since Weber the subject has been dealt with only by New Testament scholars, either with reference to certain special problems or to a more general understanding of nascent Christianity. Bousset's *Religion des Judentums*, which by its title and scope (including some four centuries), gives promise of a historical treatment, is in fact — and in the author's intention — a piece of apparatus for the student of the New Testament.

The characterization of Judaism in Weber and his followers is strikingly different from the older apologetic and polemic. None of the learned adversaries of Judaism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, though they knew the literature immeasurably better than their modern successors, ever suspected that the Rabbis entertained an 'abstract monotheism' — whatever that may be — or a 'transcendent' idea of God as the Absolute, or, to use the language of men, that in the extravagance of their 'fear of the Lord' they had magnified and exalted him out of his world, which, like an absentee proprietor, he administered henceforth by agents. Eisenmenger, who collected with inordinate zeal what he called the foolish and blasphemous things that the Jews said about God, never laid this to their charge. Nowhere, so far as I know, is a suggestion made that in this respect the Jewish idea of God differed from the Christian. So it is also with the 'legalism' which for the last fifty years has become the very definition and the all-sufficient condemnation of Judaism. It is not a topic of the older polemic; indeed, I do not recall a place where it is even mentioned. Concretely, Jewish observances are censured or ridiculed, but 'legalism' as a system of religion, not to say as the essence of Judaism, no one seems to have discovered. This is the more remarkable because this line of attack might seem to have been indicated by Paul, and because the earlier Protestant, and particularly Lutheran controversialists, were peculiarly keen on the point by reason of their conflict with the Catholic Church over works and merit.

What then brought legalism to the front in the new apologetic? Not a fresh and more thorough study of Judaism at the beginning of our era, but a new apologetic motive, consequent on a different apprehension of Christianity on the part of the New Testament theologians who now took up the task. The 'essence' of Christianity, and therefore its specific difference from Judaism, was for the first time sought in the religion of Jesus — his teaching and his personal piety. The title of Bousset's first work, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum*, is the programme of the younger school. Jesus' conflict with the Scribes and Pharisees prescribed for this apologetic the issue of legalism; the 'Father in heaven,' the piety assumed to be distinctive of Jesus and of his teaching, demanded an antithesis in Judaism, an inaccessible God, which Weber from his different starting point was supposed to have demonstrated.

In conclusion there is one thing more to be said: Where the subject of investigation is the relation of primitive Christianity to its contemporary Judaism, whether the motive be a historical understanding of nascent Christianity or an apologetic exhibition of the superiority of the religion of Jesus to that of the Scribes and Pharisees, the critical ordering and evaluation of the Jewish sources is of much greater importance than when a general comparison of Judaism and Christianity is proposed, or even when, as in Weber, the comparison is restricted to the Palestinian Judaism of three or four centuries following the Christian era. Upon this critical task, Jewish scholars, with exhaustive knowledge of the material and through philological and historical training, have in the last thirty or forty years done fundamental work. The investigation of the composition and sources of the Tannaite Midrash, for example, which is here of primary importance, has a significance comparable to the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels; and, it may perhaps be added, its results are established on a more secure basis, external and internal evidence corroborating each other. For recent Christian writers, however, all this criticism is non-existent. Even the writings themselves are known only by name. Bousset writes: "Die ältesten wesentlich halachischen

Midrasche sind Mechilta (Exodus), Siphra (Levit.), Siphre (Numeri, Deuteron.) lat. Übersetzung bei Ugolini, Thesaurus XIV-XV). Auf diese folgen die vorwiegend haggadischen, daher für uns wertvolleren Rabboth." Although Perles had made sarcastic comment on it as it stood in the first edition, this note remains unchanged in the second, perhaps because Bousset did not see the point of the sarcasm.

After so much criticism it is a welcome change to close this article with commendation of a book which, proposing only to explain and illustrate the most important conceptions and phrases in the Gospels, gives more than it promises, and shows how much light may be thrown upon the subject from Rabbinical sources by a competent scholar, I mean Gustav Dalman's *Die Worte Jesu, mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache* (1898).

APPENDIX

Inasmuch as some of these books are rare, the titles may be given here in full:

Porchetus:

The full title in Giustiniani's edition is: Victoria Porcheti adversus impios Hebraeos, in qua tum ex sacris libris tum ex dictis Talmud ac Caballistarum et aliorum omnium quos Hebraei recipiunt monstratur veritas catholicae fidei. Ex recensione R. P. Aug. Iustiniani ordinis Praedicatorii, episcopi Nebiensis. François Regnault. Paris 1520. It is a folio volume of f. xciii (188 pp.). The author begins (f. ii A): In nomine domini. Amen. Incipit liber Victoriae a Porcheto de Saluaticis Genuensi divina fauente gratia compilatus ad Judaicam perfidiam subvertendam et ut praestantius veritas fulgeat fidei christianae. The work is now very rare. I used a copy in Munich some years ago; one has recently been acquired by the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, in New York.

Galatinus:

Opus toti christianae Reipublicae maxime utile, de arcanis catholicae veritatis, contra obstinatissimam Iudaeorum nostrae tempestatis perfidiam: ex Talmud, aliisque hebraicis libris nuper excerptum et quadripleci linguarum eleganter congestum. The title page bears no date, but at the end (f. cccx A), we read: Impressum vero Orthonaë maris, summa cum diligentia per Hieronymum Suncinum: Anno christianae natiuitatis M.D.XVIII. quintodecimo kalendas martias. On an imaginary edition of Bari 1516 see the article cited in note 8.

Raimundus Martini:

Pugio Fidei Raimundi Martini Ordinis Praedicatorum adversus Mauros et Judaeos; nunc primum in lucem editus. . . . Ope et Opera Illustrissimi ac Reverendissimi D. Episcopi Lovensis [Franciscus Bosquet], Illustrissimi Praesidis D. de Maussac Comitibus Consistoriani. Cum observationibus Domini Josepho de Voisin Presbyteri, ex-Senatoris Burdegalensis. Paris, 1651.

THE ETHICS AND ESCHATOLOGY OF METHODIUS OF OLYMPUS

ERNESTO BUONAIUTI

ROME, ITALY

AMONG the many problems which confront the historian of Christian thought and life in the early centuries one of the most complex and difficult is that of the relations, practical as well as theoretical, between Christianity and asceticism. Since the age of the Reformation there has been incessant controversy over the question whether the anthropological assumptions which underlie ascetic morals — the dualistic conception of the constitution of human nature and the conviction that there is an irreconcilable opposition between body and spirit — are really identical with the principles of Christian anthropology so that there can be no experience of the gospel message apart from a radically pessimistic estimate of the possibilities of good inherent in human nature, and without the acceptance of a scale of ethical values based upon the progressive stages of an ascetic discipline.

After centuries of acrimonious theological controversy fomented by prejudices on both sides, we are now perhaps for the first time in a position to consider objectively the historical relations between the development of ascetic ideas and the propagation of the Christian piety, and consequently to solve satisfactorily the problem of the interaction between asceticism and Christianity.

At the outset we may remark that all recent investigations, from the epoch-making work of Weingarten to the more recent studies of Strathmann, Bickel, and Reitzenstein,¹ have proved conclusively that, whether as an individual or an associated

¹ Weingarten, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums*. Gotha, 1877. — Strathmann, *Geschichte der frühchristlichen Askese bis zur Entstehung des Mönchtums*. I. Die Askese in der Umgebung des werdenden Christentums. Leipzig, 1914. — Bickel, 'Das asketische Ideal bei Ambrosius, Hieronymus und Augustin,' *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, 1916. — Reitzenstein, *Historia Monachorum und Historia Lausiaca*. Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Mönchtums und der frühchristlichen Begriffe Gnostiker und Pneumatiker. Göttingen, 1916.

enterprise, asceticism, aiming to nullify the impulses of sense in the endeavor to achieve the absolute and uncontested supremacy of spirit over matter and a complete imperturbability, had a long history before Christianity and outside of Christianity; that it was common to various philosophical schools (Neopythagorean, Stoic, Neoplatonist) and to certain religious movements (the *κατοχοί* of the Serapeum in Memphis, the Essenes and Therapeutae) which have nothing in common with Christianity. It has also been shown that the ideas and language of asceticism made their way rather slowly into the thought and life of Christian society, which at the outset moved upon a moral plane entirely different from that upon which men strove by a progressive spiritual training to effect the annihilation of the energies which give its dramatic character and charm to life. It is possible also to prove that Christianity became saturated with ascetic prepossessions in the precise measure in which the mystical fervor and charismatic enthusiasm that inspired it in the heroic period of its origins gradually declined.

In thus affirming that between asceticism and primitive Christianity there was no decisive affinity, ideal or practical, that the two movements proceeded from contradictory theoretical presuppositions and tended to entirely different ends, it is not meant to deny that the message of Christian salvation implies a renunciation of lower modes of life and a reversal of ideas of value far more profound and effective than those actuated by ascetic ideals. Moreover, while the Christian renunciation springs from a sudden inner metamorphosis, a radical *μετάνοια*, through which the individual, transfigured by the experience of his calling and of his spiritual transformation, immersed in the spirit, becomes incapable of any more fulfilling or consenting to the desires and inclinations of the flesh, the painful ascetic training, not sustained by warm mystical fervor nor guided by an eager messianic-eschatological expectation, makes the impression rather of being the doubtful result of a strenuous rational effort and of an aristocratic refinement of temper which never succeeded in communicating itself to the masses or of becoming a factor in great social

changes. The Christian renunciation is larger and more complete than the ascetic renunciation; but while the former has its origin in an intense charismatic commotion and its consummation in the joy of a psychical transfiguration, the latter has its roots in a profoundly pessimistic estimation of life and its destiny, and by its endeavor after ἀπάθεια condemns itself to barrenness.

The historical process lasting several centuries through which, for the original values of πίστις, μετάνοια and χαρά, Christian apologetic eventually substituted those of γνῶσις, ἄσκησις and ἐγκράτεια was only the ethical reflection of a much larger process through which the Christian movement, originally a movement of a small minority dreaming of a cosmic palingenesis, was transformed into an official religion professed by the whole population, in which the heroic ideals came to be specially reserved for individuals who aspired to attain for themselves that τελείωσις which at the outset was the peremptory obligation of all the ἄγιοι.

Outside of the New Testament literature and that of the post-apostolic age, the author from whose writings we can gather most clearly at once the affinities and the differences between the ascetic attitude and the specifically Christian aspirations and experiences is Methodius of Olympus, the Anatolian martyr of the Maximinian persecution, who on the eve of Constantine's reform seems to reproduce in his mystical writings the most vivid and enthusiastic traits of the primitive eschatological expectation. Bonwetsch's recent excellent edition² of all the extant works of this exceptional author of the beginning of the fourth century enables us to study in its entirety, we may say, his ethical thought, and the profound and original way in which he integrated it with his hopes and with his historical and social ideas.

² Bonwetsch, Methodius. Leipzig, 1917. Bonwetsch devoted many years while teaching at the University of Dorpat to the works of Methodius. In 1891 he published a German translation of the Paleoslavlic Corpus Methodianum, and subsequently published a study on Methodius's theology (Die Theologie des Methodius. Berlin, 1903) in which the problem examined in the present article received somewhat scant attention. See also Bonwetsch's article on Methodius in the Real-Encyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Third edition, s. v.

At first sight the fate of Methodius in the literary history of the fourth century is surprising. Though an elegant and skilful writer, with a rich and deep religious experience, wearing the halo of martyrdom, he nevertheless did not receive from his contemporaries and immediate successors the recognition and appreciation which his literary productiveness and his heroic place in the history of the Church would have abundantly deserved. Adamantius reproduces large extracts from Methodius *περὶ τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου* and from his *περὶ ἀναστάσεως*, but takes good care not to name their author. Eusebius also quotes a considerable passage from the former of these two writings, but attributes it to Maximus (*De Praeparatione Evangelica* vii. 22); in Eusebius's historical works the name of Methodius never occurs. Only from Jerome do we learn that in the sixth book of his *Apology for Origen*, Eusebius leveled at Methodius the same reproach which Rufinus addressed to Jerome himself: "*Quomodo ausus est Methodius nunc contra Origenem scribere, qui haec et haec de Origenis locutus est dogmatibus*" (*Contra Rufinum* i. 11). And it is only in Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus* (83), in a paragraph which is evidently not taken like the rest from Eusebius, that we find the single notice — distorted and anachronistic, at that — which we possess about the bishop of Olympus: "*Methodius, Olympi Lyciae et postea Tyri episcopus, nitidi compositique sermonis adversus Porphyrium confecit libros et Symposium decem Virginum, de Resurrectione opus egregium contra Origenem, et adversus eundem de Pythonissa, et de αὐτεξουσία, in Genesim quoque et in Cantica Canticorum commentarios, et multa alia quae vulgo lectitantur. Et ad extremum novissimae persecutionis, sive ut alii affirmant sub Decio et Valeriano, in Chalcide Graeciae martyrio coronatus est.*"

When we recall, however, the sharply anti-Origenistic attitude of the martyr bishop, and on the other hand the deeply rooted Origenistic sympathies which characterized the productions of the most eminent representatives of ecclesiastical culture in Syria and Anatolia in the Constantinian epoch, and above all of Eusebius of Caesarea, we can easily understand how the posthumous fame of Methodius was eclipsed, and as

easily recognize the reasons why he enjoyed especial favor with Epiphanius, who praises him highly and quotes him copiously in his *Panarion*. This gives all the more reason to inquire how it came that the great ideals of renunciation which Origen had extolled and practised and Methodius had taken up to exalt with characteristic fervor appealed in the case of the two men to anthropological presuppositions and eschatological visions so diverse and contradictory.

Among the various forms and manifold elements of renunciation, virginal continence is intuitive, and naturally holds the first place. The principal dialogue of Methodius, the *Symposium*, or *περὶ ἀγνείας*, conceived and written after Platonic patterns, is a formal panegyric of virginity. Methodius imagines how Gregorium, 'the vigilant,' repeats to him the eulogies which were pronounced by ten virgins in the garden of Arete, extolling the virtue of immaculate chastity. The palm in this pious competition is bestowed on Thecla, who at the close of the *Symposium* sings a hymn to Christ the bridegroom, in which the author evidently intended to summarize in a series of stanzas³ the way in which he himself regarded virginity in the cluster of Christian virtues and in the general scheme of Christian development in the life of this world. The hymn has a recurring refrain:

I consecrate myself to thee, O Bridegroom, and holding lamps⁴ that give light I go to meet thee.

There are stanzas in this hymn from which it is manifest that Methodius was fully aware that his teaching concerning Christian perfection represented something new and unfamiliar in the Christian practice of his time, and something which is authorized only by a revived fervor of messianic expectation.

From above, O Virgins, comes the sound of a cry, the sound that raises the dead, saying, 'Go forth, all of you, to meet the bridegrooms in white robes and with your lamps, to the rising of the sun. Arise before the King comes to enter within the gates.'

³ The rhythm of this poem has been analyzed by W. Meyer, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur mittellatein. Rhythmik*. ii (1905).

⁴ The reference is, of course, to the parable of the wise and foolish virgins whose lamps did or did not give light. — Ed.

I flee from the happiness of mortals with all its sorrow, from the voluptuousness of life and from the sweets of love,⁵ and I long to be held in thy life-giving arms and forever to see thy beauty, O Blessed One.

For thee, O King, have I left the mortal couch of marriage and my golden home and have come in spotless garments that I too may come with thee to enter into thy blessed chambers.

I have escaped the myriad enchanting wiles of the serpent and I have endured the flame of fire and the manslaying onslaughts of wild beasts, and I wait for thee from heaven.

I have forgotten my country, O Logos, and I long for thy grace: I have forgotten also the company of the Virgins that are my fellows,⁶ the pride of my mother and my race, for thou, O Christ, art all things to me.

Giver of life art thou, O Christ, hail to thy light that knows no evening time. Do thou receive this cry: the company of Virgins entreats thee, O Flower of Perfection, Love, Joy, Prudence, Wisdom, Logos.

The hymn to Christ runs on for several stanzas more and then turns to the bride, the Church. Methodius is conscious that he is employing language strange to the community of the faithful and expressing forgotten conceptions and ideals. His song takes on a more fervid and elevated tone.

In hymns, O Blessed bride of God, we, thy attendants of the bride-chamber, honor thee now, O undefiled Virgin, Church with snow-white body, with dark hair, chaste, spotless, lovely.

Corruption has fled away and the tearful labors of disease. Death has been taken away and all folly has perished. Grief that wastes men's minds has perished and the joy of God has suddenly shone on mortals.

Paradise is no longer bereft of mortals, for again, as formerly, by divine decree there inhabits it he who fell by the manifold wiles of the serpent, incorruptible, without fear, blessed.

Singing the new song⁷ the company of Virgins brings thee to heaven, O Queen; thou art full of light, and they are crowned with the white flowers of lilies and bear in their hands the flames that give light.

O Blessed One, who inhabitest the undefiled seats of heaven, thou who art without beginning, who governest all things by eternal power, receive within the gates of life us, too, O Father, with thy Son, for we are come.⁸

On the surface the eulogy lavished by Methodius upon virginity, of which this hymn is only the loftiest expression, may seem not to differ greatly from the ascetic theories which about a century before had been so clearly formulated by the two great Alexandrian Christian writers, Clement and Origen.

⁵ Accepting Meyer's emendation. — Ed.

⁶ The imagery here changes to that of Psalm 45, 11 ff. — Ed.

⁷ The reference is to Rev. 5, 9 and Psalm 45. — Ed.

⁸ Symposium xi. ed Bonwetsch, pp. 131-133, 136.

But when the mystical doctrines set forth by Methodius in the *περὶ ἀγνείας* are brought into connection with the anthropological and eschatological views defended in the *περὶ ἀναστάσεως*,⁹ we immediately perceive the radical difference in the points of view from which spring on one side the asceticism of Origen and on the other the mystical enthusiasm of the Anatolian bishop.¹⁰ The *περὶ ἀναστάσεως* is a polemical treatise directed against the Origenists. Methodius imagines that at Patara, in the house of a physician, Aglaophones, the question is discussed whether the flesh really participates in the joys of the resurrection and of immortality. Two of the interlocutors, the host Aglaophones and Proclus, agree with Origen in denying to the human body, such as has lived here on earth, any capacity to share with the spirit the blessed life. Methodius on the contrary, contends that the same human body which has passed from the world to the triumph of incorruptibility will joyfully participate in that life. With an eschatological outlook which reminds us of that of the first Christian generations, Methodius maintains that the sensible universe is not so radically corrupted as not to be able to enter as an integral element into the palingenesis through which the glory of the

⁹ Of the *περὶ ἀναστάσεως* we have only the excerpts of the original Greek text in Epiphanius and Adamantius, but we possess the whole dialogue in a Paleoslavonic version, a German translation of which was published by Bonwetsch in his edition of Methodius's Works, pp. 217-424.

¹⁰ In the Symposium, Methodius' eschatological doctrine is less prominent because the argument itself, that is to say the over-valuation of virginity, did not permit emphasis on an optimistic view of the bodily nature of man. This may explain why, besides its literary excellence, the Symposium was the only work of Methodius which became very popular and exerted a wide influence on Christian literature. It has been remarked (G. La Piana, *Le Rappresentazioni sacre nella letteratura Bizantina*. Rome, 1912, pp. 167 f.) that the whole Christian literary tradition (poetical, homiletical and theological) dealing with the theories and the practice of Christian virginity in general, and with the Virgin Mary as the typical example of this exalted state, has borrowed from Methodius not only a great deal of its content and of its biblical exegesis on this virtue, but even of its terminology. In a large number of sermons to which La Piana gave the title of Dramatic Homilies, under which they are now classified in the history of Christian literature, the influence of Methodius's Symposium is evident almost in every line; cf. the Hymn to Virginity reconstructed by La Piana from the *Ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν Θεοτόκον* attributed to Proclus of Constantinople, which is merely a poetical summary of the ten speeches of the virgins in Methodius's Symposium. (*Op. cit.*, pp. 236-241 and 166-169.)

triumphant Christ is revealed, and that in it man with his corporeal nature is not the expression of evil and perversion, but represents a work of the divine artist which only needs to be slightly retouched to be fit to enjoy without limit the blessing and the joy of the Father.

For when he saw man, his fairest work, corrupted by malignant plots of envy, he could not endure to leave him thus, such was his love of man, that man might not endure blame forever or his fault remain immortal, but he dissolved him into matter once more that all the faults which were in him might perish and disappear when he was formed afresh.¹¹

In the eyes of Methodius, therefore, death is not as it was in Origen's conception the destruction of this foul bodily prison in which the soul is confined in expiation of an original sinful will to be embodied; it is rather the open passageway towards a providential restitution of the organism, which is called to a loftier destiny. In opposition to the pessimistic abhorrence of matter in which the asceticism of the Alexandrians delighted, Methodius vindicates the fundamental goodness of corporeal nature. Replying directly to an argument of Origen, he reasons that if, as Origen maintains, everything that is generated is diseased because it has needs and appetites, while only that is sound which experiences neither, and consequently man, who is generated, cannot be free from affections and immortal, it follows that angels and souls, which also are originated, are in the same case and will therefore perish. But neither angels nor souls perish, for they are immortal and indestructible as their Creator meant them to be. Therefore man also is immortal.¹²

By this acute *argumentum ad hominem* Methodius aims to demonstrate how fallacious and wholly contradictory Origen's attitude is in his estimate of the part assigned to matter in the plan of salvation.

He does not stop, however, with the negative side of his demonstration but, starting from one of the most typical features of Pauline eschatology, he rises to a grandiose vision of the intimate participation of all sensible nature in the joy of the messianic restitution.

¹¹ De Resurrectione i, 43, 3; Bonwetsch, p. 291.

¹² Ibid., i, 47, 1-2.

Nor is the statement satisfactory that everything will be utterly destroyed, and that earth, air, and heaven will no longer exist. The whole world will, indeed, be deluged with descending fire and be burnt out for purification and renewal, but it will not come to complete destruction and ruin. For if it were better for the world not to be rather than to be, why did God make the inferior choice in creating the world? No! God made nothing vainly or badly. Therefore God ordered the creation to exist and to remain, as Wisdom also confirms saying, 'For God created all things to have their being and the generations of the world were healthful and there is no poison of destruction in them.' Paul also clearly testifies to this saying, 'For the earnest expectation of creation waiteth for the revelation of the sons of God. For the creation was subject to vanity not willingly but by reason of him who subjected it in hope, that the creation itself may be set free from the bondage of corruption to the freedom of the glory of the children of God.' For, he says, the creation was subjected to vanity but is waiting to be set free from such bondage, and thus indicates that by the creation he means this world. For it is not the things which are not seen that are in bondage to corruption but these visible things. So then the creation will remain¹³ at the resurrection, renewed to a better and more beautiful state, glad and rejoicing over the children for whom it now groans and travails and is itself waiting for our redemption from the corruption of the body, that when we have been raised up and have shaken off the mortality of the flesh according to that which is written, 'Shake off the dust and rise and sit, O Jerusalem,' and when we have been set free from sin, the creation itself shall be set free from corruption, no longer in bondage to vanity but to righteousness.¹⁴

The Christian chiliasts of the second century, of whom Papias and Irenaeus are the most explicit and authoritative representatives, had concentrated their mystical religious expectations in a scheme of cosmic palingenesis which should bring to the elect a blessedness embracing their whole being, gladdened by the rejuvenation and the exuberant fruitfulness of material nature. This serene vision had given them courage to sustain the struggle with the pagan world. Now, at the dawn of the fourth century, after the ingenuous idealism of primitive Christianity had been followed by the deadening constructions of the Gnostics and of Alexandrian speculation, Methodius revived the joyous idea of the millenium, and by reflex effect his own Christian experience became more profound, more heroic, more conscious that it could not be reduced to the values and perspectives of the world. In all his argumentation Methodius pursues the spiritualizing eschatology of

¹³ It seems more probable that the text should be *μενεῖ* rather than *μένει*. — Ed.

¹⁴ Ibid., i, 47, 3-6; Bonwetsch, pp. 297-299.

Origen for the purpose of confuting and dispelling it. 'How then, our opponents say, if the universe is not destroyed, did Christ say that heaven and earth shall pass away, and the prophet that the heaven shall be dissolved like smoke and the earth grow old like a garment?' Methodius' acute reply is: 'It is the manner of scripture to use the word destruction (*ἀπώλεια*) for the transformation (*μεταβολή*) of the present constitution of the world into something better and more glorious, the previous form perishing in the change of all things into a more splendid state.'¹⁵ Thus, according to Methodius, when we read in the scriptures of a ruin of the material universe we are to think of a providential palingenesis, wherein the animate and inanimate creation shall be raised in a state of existence which, while not abolishing the fundamental characteristics of the present world, exalts and ameliorates them in the highest degree. Methodius triumphantly concludes his argument against Origen by declaring confidently that, inasmuch as all things were essentially good when they proceeded from the creative hand of God, man also, such as he is, made up of soul and body, constitutes a nature in itself good, which shall participate in the joy of the immortal life with all the elements of its composite being, excluding none.¹⁶

These eloquent extracts from the two principal writings of Methodius may suffice to show the importance of the author in the development of ethical and metaphysical ideas at the dawn of the fourth century. They also give additional evidence of the profound interaction between ethics and eschatology. Morality is the more elevated and the more heroic, the more closely it is linked to an intense expectation of an impending providential revolution which shall give a new direction to the course of events and make a final end of the injustices and defects which exist, by its very constitution, in every social organization. In the midst of the portentous effort which Christian society was making in the fourth century to reduce the gospel proclamation to the formulas of a shallow and conservative religion, capable of adapting itself to circumstances and making

¹⁵ Ibid., i, 48, 1-2.

¹⁶ Ibid., i, 50.

compromises with them, the position of Methodius seems like the last anachronistic survival of that call to heroism which had been common in primitive Christianity and had been nurtured and supported by the great chiliastic dream. And whereas at the close of the fourth century, with Epiphanius and Jerome, ascetic practice and the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh appear as the definitive reconciliation of an extra-Christian asceticism with a form of eschatology which is a substitute for primitive chiliasm, in the age of Diocletian and of Maximin the bishop of Olympus, candidate for martyrdom, delivers to Christian society the last challenge to the perfect renunciation under the simple stimulus of an enthusiastic faith in the restoration of the universe in the joy and freedom of the sons of God.

In place of this, only a few years later than Methodius, shortly after the victory of Licinius over Maximin, Eusebius of Caesarea established among Christians a dichotomy, which, while destined to have a clamant success in the subsequent evolution of Christian society, unquestionably represented the radical rejection of that programme of perfection which, according to the majority of Christian authors before Constantine, should have been the irremovable goal of every believer, who by definition and vocation was *τέλειος*. In the *Demonstratio Evangelica* Eusebius wrote:

. . . 'So that even for the Church of Christ rules have been laid down for two ways of life. The one is above nature and beyond ordinary human life; it admits neither marriage nor the begetting of children nor the acquirement or retention of property; it changes the ordinary and accustomed behavior of all men from beginning to end and makes them live for the service of God alone in the strength of heavenly love. Those who change over to this way seem to be dead to the life of mortals, and do but carry their body on earth for their soul has been translated in spirit to heaven. Like dwellers in heaven they look at the life of men, consecrated for the whole race to the God who is over all . . . not by animal sacrifices and blood nor by libations and sweet savor of offerings . . . but by sound doctrines of true piety and the disposition of a purified soul, and further by virtuous deeds and words. In this way, propitiating the divinity, they perform a priestly office in their own behalf and in behalf of others.' Such is the perfect way of Christian life. There is, however, Eusebius continues, another way, more within ordinary human capacity, which does not demand the abandonment of the rights and duties that belong to the political and social life of mankind. To contract marriage, have children, attend to business, faithfully obey the laws of the state, and in all spheres fulfil the tasks of a normal citizen — these are all things per-

fectly compatible with the Christian profession, provided with them be joined the strenuous purpose to maintain piety and devotion to the Lord. Christianity accepts as wholly praiseworthy this second rule of life also, in order that no class of men and no group of peoples may imagine themselves deprived of the eminent benefits of the 'saving manifestation' of Christ.¹⁷

Thus Eusebius, the future counsellor of Constantine, formulated that distinction between precepts and counsels in which the ethics of collective Christianity were ever thereafter to find their basis. Origen, also, had distinguished among Christians *πρακτικοί* from *θεωρητικοί*, but to the former had assigned as the proper place for them only the forecourt of the temple, while to the temple itself he granted access only to the pure. Eusebius, now, having regard to the pressing exigencies of a Christianity which by the very fact that it now aspired to be the religion of the majority was constrained to mitigate its primitive moral programme, combines in the same Christian profession the two categories of believers. It is easy to understand how in his eyes the exalted mysticism of Methodius and his attempt to reanimate the enthusiasm of the Christian renunciation by reviving the fervor of chiliastic expectation must have seemed like the vain self-deception of a man hopelessly behind the times. The historian who had described the ancient Papias of Hieropolis as a man 'scant of brains' could not have looked with complacency upon his successor in the fourth century. Methodius had to wait long decades before he found in Epiphanius an adequate appreciation of his doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, although even in the Panarion the bishop of Salamis takes pains to purge his anti-Origenistic thought of the suspicion of chiliasm.

Christian society after Constantine found it most convenient to adopt the sharp distinction Eusebius made between the two different ways in which it is possible to live according to the gospel. But in the course of the centuries every revival of the religious spirit finds itself carried back to the mystical conception of the earliest Christian generations for which the message of Christ could be taken in only one possible way, in that, namely, which demands renunciation of the world in the expectation of perfect righteousness.

¹⁷ *Demonstratio Evangelica*, i, 8.

AMERICAN THEISTS

JOHN WRIGHT BUCKHAM

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

THE problem of the existence and nature of God, remote and oppressive though it is to some minds, to others is of all questions the most urgent and engaging. It has had its fascination for the mind of America, as for that of all intelligent peoples.

Among the outstanding names in American theism one of the first to attract the student is that of Theodore Parker (1810-1860), transcendentalist and theist.¹ His is a theological rather than a philosophical theism. Indeed for him theism meant *theology*, a reasonable theology as over against the rigid orthodoxy which he combats. He dwelt in that cosmically dim hour before the dawn of evolution, and argued for a minutely fore-known universe, of which God "knew perfectly all the actions, movements and history, at the moment of creation as well as today,"² and by his "infinite engineering brought them to pass without infringing upon freedom." In his roseate theodicy God created man and nature "from a perfect motive, of perfect material, for a perfect purpose, and as perfect means to achieve that purpose." He expunges the stigma of imperfection and evil from the present order by positing a future of unending bliss for every creature as well as for every man. Such assumptions mark the preacher rather than the philosopher. And yet there is in his *Sermons on Theism* (1853) a tide of conviction, a largeness of outlook, and a sense of ultimate values, which cannot be dismissed as mere sentiment. It is true that some of his arguments fall upon the modern mind with an undeniable antiquity of accent. They are as the idle wind which it respects not. But the sweep of his faith in a "Father-Mother" God, the breadth of his sympathy, the glow of his imagination, the strength of his conviction, still speak from his

¹ Professor Caldecott terms him "the most confident intuitionist I can find since Herbert." *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 99.

² *Views of Religion*, p. 100.

highly-colored pages, as they did from his famous pulpit, with the power of permanent worth.

The year 1881 witnessed the publication of two volumes of exceptional character in the field of Theism, Diman's *The Theistic Argument* and Mulford's *The Republic of God*.

J. Lewis Diman, the author of *The Theistic Argument* was from 1864 until his death in 1881 Professor of History and Political Economy in Brown University. Before that time he had been in the Christian ministry, having spent two years in Germany, mainly engaged in the study of Kant. His interest in philosophy was life-long, and when in 1880 he was invited to deliver a course of lectures before the Lowell Institute on its foundation of Natural Religion, he found himself drawn to the subject of Theism.

The course opened with a discussion of the relativity of knowledge, in which the author concludes that "while we conceive that the Absolute cannot be known as the product of any inductive or deductive reasoning from the phenomena presented to the senses, we affirm that it is and can be known as the correlate which must be necessarily assumed to explain and account for those phenomena."³ He then presents in free and compact form the several classic arguments for the existence of God, throwing the whole burden of proof upon none of them, but treating them all as "but stages in a single rational process and parts of one comprehensive proof."⁴ The knowledge of God, he holds, grows with us as we grow. Nor is God a distant Being. "We know him simply and naturally as we know our fellow men."⁵

The part which intuition plays in this growing knowledge of God is described thus:

While we had no hesitation in rejecting intuition as an exclusive and immediate source of our belief in the divine existence, we recognize intuition as essential to the completeness of the theistic argument . . . as a part of cognition, as the final and legitimate step to which the intellectual process leads.⁶

The question arises whether intuition, as a cognitive act of the whole personality, does not also *initiate* the knowledge of God

³ *The Theistic Argument*, p. 64.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 317.

ratiocination serving to ratify and confirm that which intuition seizes.

Professor Diman's theism was supplemented and surpassed — at least in the extent of its influence — by the well-known author of *The Nation*, Elisha Mulford, in *The Republic of God*.⁷ He was the author of but two volumes, but these, the fruit of long study and reflection, gave him a deep and lasting influence upon American thought. *The Nation* (1870) — rewritten, Mr. H. E. Scudder states, seven times, beside subsequent alterations in correcting the proof — ⁸ has taken rank as one of the major treatises on the American theory of the state.

The Republic of God (1881) has an atmosphere of its own in American theological literature. After the tumult and shouting of the polemic period of theology it came with the elemental calm and persuasiveness of pure, rational conviction. It does not strive nor cry, neither does it argue nor dogmatize. Its stately and mature affirmations carry the weight of sincere and ripe reflection. It is the Fourth Gospel among American theologies. It grounds theism in consciousness, whence it cannot be dislodged.

The being of God is the precedent and the postulate of the thought of God. It is the ground in man of his conscious life. From the beginning, and with the growth of the human consciousness, there is the consciousness of the being of God, and of a relation to God.⁹

The chapter, "The Personality of God," did much to lift the conception of personality to its true level. "There is in personality," wrote Dr. Mulford, "the highest that is within the knowledge of man. It is the steepest summit toward which we move in our attainment. . . . The personality of God does not involve limitation. The only limitation is self-limitation — the limit which it sets in its own self-determination."¹⁰ Such

⁷ Elisha Mulford was born in Montrose, Pa., in 1833, and died in Cambridge, Mass. in 1885. Like Diman he was a student of philosophy. He graduated at Yale College, studied at Union and Andover Seminaries, and at Halle and Heidelberg Universities, was ordained as an Episcopal minister and served several parishes. In 1881 he removed to Cambridge and delivered courses of lectures on theology at the Episcopal Divinity School.

⁸ See his article on Elisha Mulford in the *Atlantic Monthly*, lvii, 362.

⁹ *Republic of God*, p. 1.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23 (first edition).

words have become familiar to us in the present century. But at the time, and in the fullness of the realization of their import in which they were written, they meant much. The discussion of the divine attributes also shows how far this emancipated thinker had risen above the conventional scholasticism of Protestant theology.

The impression which Mulford made upon American theology is comparable in some respects, though less in degree, to that of Maurice in England, by whom he was greatly influenced. One may readily detect the impact of Coleridge upon his thought and style. And yet there is nothing whatever of imitation, for upon every page one can discern freedom and originality of thought and expression.¹¹

Both Diman and Mulford wrote in the philosophic temper, and made contributions of value to theism, but neither presented what could be called an exhaustive treatment of the subject. This remained to be done by Professor Samuel Harris, whose sterling volume, *The Philosophical Basis of Theism* (1883), takes rank, as on the whole the leading American work on this subject. It is to be hoped that Yale University, mother of theologians, will sometime see that there is an adequate biography of this comprehensive and independent thinker, eminent among her great teachers, and regarded with admiration and gratitude by his students.¹²

The *Philosophical Basis of Theism* bears evidence of years of toil and reflection. It shows a thoroughly comprehensive and well-digested knowledge of the literature of philosophy, as well as a wide acquaintance with general literature. It is clear

¹¹ A biographical sketch of Dr. Mulford and his work, by Dr. T. T. Munger, may be found in *The Century Magazine*, xiii, 888.

¹² Samuel Harris came of a Maine family, and was born in East Machias, June 14, 1814. He graduated from Bowdoin College in 1833 and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1838. He was a Congregational pastor until 1855, when he became professor of Systematic Theology in Bangor Theological Seminary. In 1867 he was called to the presidency of Bowdoin College, and in 1871 became Dwight Professor of Systematic Theology in the Yale Divinity School, continuing in this office until he was made professor emeritus in 1896. His death occurred in 1899. His portrait, together with those of Dr. C. C. Everett, H. B. Smith, and other Maine theologians, may be found in an article by W. I. Cole, 'Maine in Literature,' *New England Magazine*, August 1890.

as well as profound in thought, and is written with an ease and a strength of sustained interest which are too rare in such treatises.

Starting with the assumption that if theism is to stand the test of rational criticism it must be grounded on a broad philosophical basis, Professor Harris introduces his work with a careful study of the nature and reality of knowledge. He bases the reliability of knowledge upon its self-evidencing character. Although admitting that "in human intelligence there is a nucleus of knowledge surrounded by a zone of probability, opinion and doubt,"¹³ he regards this nucleus as having the character of genuine knowledge, and hence as wholly trustworthy. In common with practically all apologetic writers of that period, he directs his criticism of Agnosticism against Herbert Spencer, its arch-proponent, who has served innumerable philosophers and theologians as a *pièce de résistance* by means of whom a new sense of confidence in the reliability of spiritual knowledge was gained.

Harris divides the acts and processes of knowing into three classes: Intuition, Representation, and Reflection. Intuition is immediate and self-evident knowledge. It exists in two forms Perception, or Presentative Intuition, and Rational Intuition. The former includes sense-perception and self-consciousness. It gives us the objects or particular realities about which we think. Rational Intuition is the immediate and self-evident knowledge of universal truths or principles. Representation is knowledge of a reality originally presented in intuition and now *re-presented* in a mental image or concept. Reflection or Thought is the reflex action of the intellect attending to the reality known in presentative intuition, and apprehending, differentiating, and integrating it (thesis, antithesis, synthesis) under the regulation of the principles known in rational intuitions, and concluding in a judgment.

On the surface this looks not a little like the Intuitionism of the Scotch school, supplemented by Hegelianism. But closer scrutiny reveals the difference. In his *Intuitions of the Mind*, McCosh wrote:

¹³ *Philosophical Basis of Theism*, p. 22.

Our intuitive convictions are thus not ideas, notions, judgments, formed apart from objects, but are in effect discoveries of something in objects or relating to them. . . . Intuitively the mind contemplates an event happening in time, and then by a further process arrives at the notion of time. The mind has not intuitively an idea of cause or causation in the abstract, but discovering a given effect, it looks for a specific cause.¹⁴

This is evidently far removed from Harris's epistemology. Indeed we have here all the difference between Idealism and Realism.

In his treatment of Rational Intuition, by which comes the knowledge of God, Professor Harris seeks first of all to establish the validity of Reason. He meets the objection that Reason breaks down in self-contradictions by showing that Kant's antinomies, rightly understood, are not contradictions, but opposite poles of bi-polar truth.¹⁵ They became contradictions for Kant "because of his phenomenalism; his antithesis of phenomenon and noumenon is so complete that they are reciprocally exclusive and therefore contradictory."¹⁶

Rational Intuition reveals five unchanging forms, under which (since the Universe is grounded in Reason) all existences may be subsumed: the True, the contrary of which is the Absurd; the Right, the contrary of which is the Wrong; the Perfect, the contrary of which is the Imperfect; the Good, the contrary of which is the Unworthy or Evil; the Absolute (or Unconditioned), the contrary of which is the Finite (or Conditioned). The first four are the norms or standards of Reason. The fifth, as the Unconditioned and All-conditioning, stands by itself and is the basis of Theology.¹⁷

Rational Intuition does not give the knowledge of Being but only of its unchanging forms. Knowledge of Being is given by Presentative Intuition:

The intuition that Absolute Being must exist presupposes the knowledge of beings. Beings are already known to exist; thus Reason sees that a Being that is absolute and unconditioned must exist.¹⁸ . . . The idea of God has content in consciousness through five ultimate ideas of the reason, and not as Kant holds, through the Practical Reason alone.¹⁹

This account of the forms of Rational Intuition is manifestly

¹⁴ Part I, Book i, Section iv.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 130.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

open to criticism. The Good and the Perfect are too closely akin to admit of clear demarcation; the Perfect and the Absolute have too much in common to warrant separate classification. The present-day psychologist would doubtless belittle the whole attempt as having been rendered irrelevant by psychology. But the last word on that subject has not been spoken.

A discussion of Personality ensues upon the foregoing. Professor Harris defines personality thus: "A Person is a being conscious of self, subsisting in individuality and identity, and endowed with intuitive reason, rational sensibility and free-will."²⁰ The will is the person's power of self-determination. The determinations of the will are of two kinds, Choice and Volition. Man is *self-conditioning*. God alone is *self-existent* and independent, unconditioned and all-conditioning.

After an extended refutation of materialistic objections to the existence of personal beings (Chapter xvii), the author introduces a chapter on "The Two Systems of Nature and Personality," thus aligning himself with James Marsh and the Coleridgeans. His final emphasis is upon the existence of God as necessary to the trustworthiness of the human reason, the community of human knowledge, and the completeness of human thought, since it combines knowledge of all particulars in the unity of an all-comprehending system.²¹

The somewhat abstract character of this discussion was supplemented by Harris's companion volume, *The Self-Revelation of God* (1886), in which emphasis is laid upon the *experiential* nature of the knowledge of God. Revelation is here treated, not according to the older idea of an external *datum*, but as self-disclosure, such as Personality naturally makes of itself to others. In the case of the Supreme Person, revelation makes use of the structure and course of nature, the constitution and history of man, and redemption through Christ. The idea of God as Absolute Being is retained, but the predominant conception is that of Personal Spirit.

These two volumes, with a third, *God, the Creator and Lord of All* (1896), form an institute of Theism rarely equalled in

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 408.

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 560, 561.

scope, balance, and sustained strength, and in the harmonizing of philosophical and theological thought.

In marked contrast with the voluminous Philosophical Theism of Professor Harris is the succinct and dramatic Cosmic Theism of John Fiske, who approached the subject from the angle of the scientist rather than that of the theologian or philosopher. The inclusion of John Fiske among the leading American theists may seem to be a case of a scientific Saul among the theological prophets. Whether his rôle were such or not, there can be little doubt that at a time when — owing to the materialistic interpretation of evolution — Christian theism in America was threatened with abandonment by a host of thoughtful minds, it was he more than any other writer, who turned back the tide.

An instructive experience, singularly characteristic of his time, fitted Mr. Fiske for this task. It may be traced with clearness in the pages of his biography.²² Branded as an infidel and skeptic by his minister, and virtually excommunicated as a boy from the orthodox church of Middletown, Conn., for having in his library volumes by Voltaire, Comte, Strauss, and John Stuart Mill; regarded for a time at Harvard College as a dangerous radical; his volume *Cosmic Evolution* greeted by the religious press as the work of an enemy of religion, Mr. Fiske knew what it meant to feel the full force of the *odium theologicum*. And yet he was neither embittered by it nor deflected from his course. Having become an admirer and apostle of Herbert Spencer in his student days, and continuing such after mature study and reflection, he became the leading exponent of the Spencerian philosophy in this country. Yet at one most vital point he found Spencer lacking, and so freely and frankly expressed his divergence as practically to repudiate the Spencerian Agnosticism. Spencer's religious attitude did not at all satisfy him. It is quite evident from several of Spencer's letters to Fiske published in Mr. Clark's volumes that Spencer had little or no interest in the religious aspects of evolution. In his acknowledgments of Fiske's writings and in his comments upon his utterances he habitually avoids the subject of religion;

²² John Fiske: *Life and Letters*. By John Spencer Clark. 2 vols. (1917).

but on one occasion, at the farewell dinner given him in New York on November 9, 1882, after Mr. Fiske's speech in response to the toast "The Doctrine of Evolution and Religion," he expressed himself as much pleased, and afterwards, wrote, "I wanted to say how successful and how important I thought was your presentation of the dual aspect, theological and ethical, of the Evolution doctrine."²³ Aside from this single indication of approval, Spencer apparently did not sympathize with Fiske's disposition to find religious significance in the evolution theory. Yet Fiske pursued his purpose. At a period when pretty much all of the theological, and most of the philosophical, world resounded with criticism and often with denunciation of Herbert Spencer and his agnosticism — a large part of it well directed — it was a signal achievement for Fiske, while supporting Spencer, to turn the findings of the evolution theory away from Agnosticism toward a theistic interpretation of the cosmos.

The chief deliverance of Mr. Fiske on the relation of evolution to religion is contained in two lectures given before the Concord School of Philosophy, *The Destiny of Man* (1884), and *The Idea of God as Affected by Modern Knowledge* (1885). If the Concord School had done nothing more than to call forth these two lectures its existence would have been more than justified.

The theism outlined in "The Idea of God" is very different from the "Anthropomorphic Theism" which Fiske criticized in his *Cosmic Philosophy*, and against which, under the caption of "Finite Theology," Theodore Parker had hurled his thunderbolts. And yet Fiske advanced a very definite and positive teleology, which recognizes that "there is a reasonableness in the universe such as to indicate that the Infinite Power of which it is the multiform manifestation is psychical."²⁴ Remaining loyal to Spencer and averring that his characterization of God as "Unknowable" presents "only one aspect of Deity,"²⁵ Fiske managed to transform the dreaded shadow of evolution into an angel of light.

²³ *Op. cit.*, ii, 264.

²⁴ *The Idea of God*, Preface, p. xxix.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xxx.

The argument for the existence of God which he advances is the design argument, reconstructed upon the lines of the evolutionary hypothesis:

The events of the universe are not the work of chance, neither are they the outcome of blind necessity. Practically there is a purpose in the world whereof it is our highest duty to learn the lesson, however well or ill we may fail in rendering a scientific account of it. When from the dawn of life we see all things working together toward the evolution of the highest spiritual attributes of Man, we know, however the words may stumble in which we try to say it, that God is in the deepest sense a Moral Being. The everlasting source of phenomena is none other than the infinite Power that makes for righteousness.²⁶

The presentation is impaired by a tone of assurance, not to say dogmatism, as of one speaking from a new seat of authority. Its somewhat dramatic form admits also some rather sweeping doctrinal generalizations, as Professor George Harris indicated in his review of the volume in the *Andover Review*.²⁷ Moreover, as the same critic also pointed out, its sole reliance upon teleology affords a quite inadequate basis for a sufficient theism. And yet, with all its assumptions and omissions, this skilful etching of "a well-marked dramatic tendency toward the *dé-nouement* of which everyone of the myriad little acts of life and death during the entire series of geologic aeons was assisting" ²⁸ constituted a unique and brilliant contribution to American thought. Without it our theistic literature would be not only far duller but far less advanced.

Mr. Fiske was not a profound thinker nor a man of marked religious sentiment, but he had an exceptionally sane, reverent, and forceful mind, and the fact that as the leading exponent of evolution in America he threw his judgment unhesitatingly on the side of theism carried a great deal of weight at a time when there was much mental confusion and disturbance. The *Idea of God* has gone through fifteen editions, and will not cease to be read for many years to come.

It is worthy of note that in his *Interpretation of Nature* (1893) Professor N. S. Shaler took an attitude toward evolution similar to that of Fiske. In a recent volume, *The Order of Nature*

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 166, 167.

²⁸ *The Idea of God*, p. 161.

²⁷ Vol. v, pp. 98-102.

(1917), Professor Lawrence J. Henderson also finds indications in nature of an evolutionary teleology, though with a far greater reserve than either Fiske or Shaler. He writes as follows:

Nothing more remains than to admit that the riddle surpasses us and to conclude that the contrast of mechanism with teleology is the very foundation of the order of nature, which must ever be regarded from two complementary points of view, as a vast assemblage of changing systems, and as an harmonious unity of changeless laws and qualities working together in the process of evolution.²⁹

We meet with a similar faith in the theistic implications of the developmental theory, but with a contrasted point of view and method, in the theist whose work we are next to consider, Charles Carroll Everett, the publication of whose theological lectures under the title *Theism and the Christian Faith* (1909) added a contribution of large and permanent value to the literature of Theism.³⁰

Doctor Everett's long and fruitful term of service as professor of Theology in the Harvard Divinity School (1869-1900) ran parallel with that of Samuel Harris at Yale.³¹ The two teachers were alike in their philosophic vision, wide knowledge of philosophy and literature, penetration of mind, and skill and charm of expression. They were alike also in their faith in intuition and in idealism. Yet they differed in their types of idealism. Harris was more the Kantian, Everett the Hegelian, although neither of them was in any sense a camp-follower, but each an independent thinker.

If anyone imagines that it is impossible to find a course of lectures in theology that is at once free, profound, and engaging, he may be disillusioned by looking into Professor Everett's course as reported and edited by the Reverend Edward Hale.

²⁹ Page 209.

³⁰ Dean W. W. Fenn of the Harvard Divinity Faculty has made a valuable summary and evaluation of Professor Everett's theology in *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. iii, 1-23.

³¹ Charles Carroll Everett was born in Brunswick, Me., June 19, 1829. He graduated from Bowdoin College, and studied at Berlin University, Germany. He was librarian of Bowdoin College Library for five years, and professor of Modern Languages, 1855-57. In 1869 he joined the faculty of Harvard Divinity School and from 1879 until his death in 1900 was Dean of the School.

Here is no dry-as-dust dogmatism, but life, movement, literature. Dr. Everett was accustomed to begin his course of lectures with the following definition of religion, to be found in his volume, *The Psychological Elements of Religious Faith* (1902): "Religion is a feeling toward a Supernatural Presence manifesting itself in Truth, Goodness and Beauty." This definition he traced through six phases of development, beginning with the simple "feeling" of primitive religion and culminating in "feeling toward a spiritual presence, manifesting itself in Truth, Goodness and Beauty, especially as illustrated in the life and teaching of Jesus and as experienced in every soul that is open to its influence."³² These three — Truth (or Unity), Goodness, and Beauty — in harmony with Plato, he presents as the three Ideas of Reason and the guides to the knowledge of God. Unity he finds existent in three forms: Unity in time, or Eternity; Unity in space, or Omnipresence; and Dynamic Unity, or Omnipotence. Thus we have, in place of Harris' *five* forms of Reason, Everett's *three* forms, with a somewhat differing content, although there is a fundamental agreement between them.

In making Truth coincident with Unity, Dr. Everett adopts a norm which in spite of its inclusiveness limits him. Unity is a fundamental quality of truth, but when made supreme it forces into the background that which has become the chief quest of contemporary philosophy, Reality. With so exclusive an emphasis upon Unity he naturally became enmeshed in the web of Hegelianism. It is true that he rejected an abstract unity as applied to God in favor of a "concrete unity in which the parts are not done away with but taken up into the whole";³³ and yet there is wanting a certain sense of personality which is not to be had when Unity is made the supreme category. The supremacy of the category of Unity tends to subordinate goodness, or moral truth, to theoretical truth. Along with this goes also the disposition to minimize evil which the Hegelian finds it so hard to avoid. It does not remedy the situation to make sin a factor in the "negative

³² See W. W. Fenn, *l. c.*, p. 20.

³³ *Theism and the Christian Faith*, p. 51.

movement" by which man is brought into conflict with his environment, as Everett does. This offers too negative an account of sin. It is not enough to define sin as "a state of inertia, the resting in some lower plane of life, where it is possible to rise to a higher."³⁴ It is that — and more.

Christianity is truly presented by Everett as the religion of reconciliation; yet Christianity is not so much concerned to reconcile good and evil as to reconcile the *Author* of good and the *sinner*. In other words, persons, rather than their products, are the true objects of reconciliation.

Especial emphasis is laid by Everett upon the idea of Beauty in theism, which he rightly contends, "has been too much left out of account by many theologians." Beauty is defined as "the manifestation of the glory of God";³⁵ which glory is "the self-manifestation of the divine nature regarded as the sum of all ideals." Such self-manifestation, he points out, necessarily excludes abstract unity and all forms of pantheism. "When the divine nature is conceived merely as abstract unity there can be, of course, no self-manifestation, no outpouring of the divine nature, no glory of God."³⁶ Man glorifies God by self-fulfilment, by means of which he fills his place in the universe. His description of the Divine Glory and Blessedness as consisting in Active Love³⁷ reminds the reader of Jonathan Edwards. Here, at least, the Berkeleian Calvinist and the Hegelian Unitarian are in striking harmony, both in spirit and in idea.

While the emphasis upon Divine Personality is less marked in the theism of Everett than in that of Harris, the ruling idea of God is the same, that of Spiritual Presence; and that means Personality. At the same time Divine Personality, in Everett's thought, is more or less shadowed by the conception of the Absolute. In elevating Idea above Reality, Hegelianism — even in such a modification of it as this — inevitably veils the realization of God behind the thought of God. If knowledge is confined to *ideas*, the idea of God, as Everett recognizes at the outset of his discussion, is necessarily a rep-

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 60.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, chap. vii.

resentation, a *Vorstellung*, but if knowledge is *not* confined to ideas, if it is recognized as deeper and fuller than ideas, using them only as its instruments, then it is possible to have a knowledge of God that is far more than a *Vorstellung*. The knowledge by personal beings of one another can hardly be confined to representation. Whatever its ultimate nature, it would seem to be primarily presentative and only secondarily representative. In relating itself to other aspects of knowledge and other forms of reality, the knowledge of God is doubtless representative, indirect, mediate; but in itself is it not more direct and experiential than Professor Everett conceived it to be?

A number of other noteworthy books on theism by American authors have appeared, among which may be mentioned: *A Theodicy* (1859), by Albert Taylor Bledsoe, at that time Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy in the University of Missouri; *The Theistic Conception of God* (1875), by B. F. Cocker, professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in the University of Michigan; Borden P. Bowne's *Philosophy of Theism* (1888);³⁸ George P. Fisher's *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief* (1902); Josiah Royce's and George H. Howison's *The Conception of God* (1897);³⁹ William N. Clarke's *The Christian Doctrine of God* (1909); Richard Wilde Micou's *Basic Ideas in Religion* (1916); George A. Gordon's *Aspects of the Infinite Mystery* (1916).⁴⁰

A contribution to the literature of theism of marked value appeared in the year 1890 entitled *Belief in God* (Winkley Lectures at Andover Theological Seminary), by President Jacob Gould Schurman, at that time Sage professor of Philosophy at Cornell University. As a condensed and succinct statement of the grounds of theism it is in many respects unrivalled. President Schurman entitles his Theism *anthropocosmic*, since it is based on the double facts of the cosmos and human nature. From a study of the implications underlying the totality of

³⁸ See *The Personalist*, vol. i, No. 1, pp. 27 ff. Professor Borden P. Bowne's *Theism and Personalism* have been omitted from this discussion for the reason that I hope to discuss them at length in a volume upon *American Philosophy*.

³⁹ See *The Harvard Theological Review*, viii (1915), 219-237.

⁴⁰ See *Progressive Religious Life in America*, chap. iii.

phenomena he reaches the conclusion that "the ground or immanent cause of the universe must be an Infinite Spirit." This Spirit, interpreted through personality, is Love. It would be difficult to find a finer interpretation of Christianity as it is seen in the light of a rational philosophy than President Schurman presents in his closing chapter, "Belief in God as Father of Spirits," from which the following passage is taken:

Nothing requires us then to modify the conclusion already reached that love is the complete expression of the moral character of God. This also is the burden of the revelation through Christ as it is the one imperishable idea of every form of the Christian faith. I believe, therefore, that it is to the religion of Christ, as the absolute religion, that we shall find ourselves approximating, the deeper our soundings in the soul of man and of nature. But that religion is not to be confounded with any rigid and unprogressive creed that claims, in a formidable array of ancient articles, a monopoly of Christian truth. Not merely do we need, what Locke so earnestly demanded, a broadening of the bottom of religion; we need also a recognition of its constant progressiveness. For our knowledge of God must continue to grow with our knowledge of humanity and nature through which alone he reveals himself. The endless problem of religious thought will therefore be the re-setting of the religion of Christ in the framework of contemporary knowledge.⁴¹

In connection with this volume should be mentioned Professor Arthur Kenyon Rogers' ⁴² *The Religious Conception of God* (1907), in which the author defends "a view of the world which is frankly religious and theistic."⁴³ Professor Rogers deliberately adopts this view in preference to "the attitude of disinterested spectator" in which the philosopher "assumes a position outside the world's life and makes it simply a subject on which to exercise one's skill in dialectic."⁴⁴

It is impossible to glance over even so limited a sector of the history of Theism without realizing that it is in its very nature a progressive science. The idea of God, as well as the experience of God, develops and deepens and expands with the growing mind of man. Such has been the case in American thought.

⁴¹ *Belief in God*, pp. 260, 261.

⁴² At the time this volume was published, Doctor Rogers was professor of Philosophy in Butler College. Since 1918 he has been professor of Philosophy in Yale University.

⁴³ Page 1.

⁴⁴ Page 3.

It is true that many minds refuse with no little heat to accept this alternative; the idea of God for them is a fixed and unchangeable *datum*. It is easy to fall into the assumption that here knowledge has reached the limit of its possibilities. What more can be learned of God than the fundamental truths of his "nature and government" as disclosed in the laws of the mind itself, in nature, and in "revelation"? So it seemed to the scholasticism of the Middle Ages and again to the divines of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. But this proved a misconception. *Stability* in the idea of God does not mean fixity. There is no fixity of idea in such a realm as this, representing as it does the highest and widest of our concepts. It is, to be sure, difficult to see in what direction so ultimate an idea as that of God can farther expand. No age can see how the next can possibly advance further; but the advance comes, taking up into itself the best that has gone before, and carrying enlarged experience on into enlarging idea.